THE FINANCES OF THE SCOTTISH CROWN IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

CRAIG MADDEN

DEGREE OF PHD.
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

VOL I.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ON SOURCES AND METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The later Middle Ages has provided the historian with written evidence on a scale unparallelled in earlier centuries. Nowhere is this trend more noticeable than in Scotland for, prior to the fourteenth century, surviving records are so scanty that much of the history of early Mediaeval Scotland must remain mere conjecture. However, in common with other countries of western Europe, the fourteenth and especially the fifteenth centuries witnessed a dramatic increase in the amount of documented evidence which has survived to provide historians of this period with a heritage sufficient to gain considerable insight into many aspects of life in the later Middle Ages.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, there was a drive towards greater documentation as increasingly powerful central bureaucracies placed greater reliance on written evidence. The monarchies of France, England and Spain, and especially the Roman Curia, developed a strong central government, from which emanated a flood of records and written instructions in the form of mandates from the king or council to a hierarchy of officials, a series of charters, writs, letters and injunctions from the chancery, financial records from Exchequer and Treasury, a compendium of legislative statutes and a mass of records from judicial proceedings. From the late thirteenth century, there was a steady flow of public records, preserved not only for their own sake but also for use on a later occasion, for past records were frequently resurrected for subsequent consultation. Associated with this development was the rise of the office of royal secretary through whom many of these official instructions was issued.[1]

---

1. By the end of the fifteenth century, the secretary developed from a purely administrative office to a position of considerable executive power, the forerunner of the later secretary of state.

In Scotland, this development in the central administration was considerably slower and less dramatic than in France or England. During most of the fourteenth century, the central government machinery in Scotland was retarded, principally by two features, firstly the desperate struggle for independance against the advances of Edward I had a disruptive effect on the social, economic and political life of the country, and, secondly the weakness of the Scottish crown following the death of Robert I resulted in the lack of a central directive force to give impetus to any reorganisation of the royal administration. However, in the fifteenth century, there is evidence of a conscious attempt on the part of the crown to revitalise central government in similar vein to the earlier developments in France or England. The turning point came in 1424 with the return of James I from captivity in England. His first hand experience of the highly developed English administrative system and his determination to resurrect the power and prestige of the Scottish crown, encouraged James to adopt some of the features of this new style of bureaucratic government. One of the principal features of this development was the reform of the financial administration, undertaken soon after his return whereby the fiscal powers of the chamberlain, which had been closely associated with the baronial domination of the house of Albany, were taken over by the new offices of treasurer and comptroller which were much more under the control of the crown. During the fifteenth century, other developments became evident, namely the formation of body of professional civil servants, including both laymen and ecclesiastics, whose advancement was dependant on loyal service to the crown. The reign of James III witnessed the establishment of Edinburgh as the permanent centre of government while, during the reign of James IV, the office of secretary under Patrick Paniter, became a prominent feature of royal administration.

Coupled with the rather belated development of the central administration in Mediaevel Scotland was the low survival rate of source material. The combination of accidental distruction, the damaging effect of periodic

English invasions and an unsettled political climate has been largely responsible for the shortage of documented evidence. Concerning financial records, the fire which destroyed part of the Exchequer buildings early in the morning of 10 November 1811 probably accounted for most of the sheriffs' rolls since an audit of these rolls held the previous year had related that these records were 'tolerably complete'.[2] Destruction or loss of such evidence was exacerbated by the fact that, despite the existance of some duplicates, it was not normal practice to enroll more than one copy of accounts. Although certain financial rolls for the period 1264 to 1266 and 1288 to 1290 had survived for the epoch prior to the wars of independance,[3] it is likely that many of these early records were removed to England by Edward I.

However, from the reigh of David II public records have survived to the present day with a greater degree of consistancy than previous centuries. During the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries written documentation of most of the spheres of royal administration has survived to provide the historian of the period with a much clearer insight into the social political, economic, diplomatic and constitutional features of late Mediaeval Scotland. A further boost was given to the preservation of written source material with the introduction of printing into Scotland during the reign of James IV. On 15 September 1507 a royal letter of licence was granted to Walter Chapman and Andrew Millar, both burgesses of Edinburgh, to furnish and bring home 'ane prent with al stuff belangand thairto and export men to use the sammyn' and this machine was to be employed for the printing of law books, the various

---

2. In 1800 a report of the records in the custory of the Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Scotland was made to the Committee on Public Records. King's Remembrancer's Office Letter Book, viii, 195-221, xii, 176. Treasury Minute Book, xiv, 344.

3. These thirteenth century financial rolls are represented only by a transcript made for the earl of Haddington which gave extracts from the rolls for those particular years.

Parliamentary statutes, chronicles, mass books and other material. The cost of the enterprise was to be sustained by Chapman and Millar who were conceded the sole right to print.[4]

Almost all the financial records from the reign of David II to 1513 are printed in the thirteenth volumes of The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, edited by George Burnett, Thomas Thompson's three volumes of 'The Accounts of the Great Chamberlain of Scotland and the first four volumes of The Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer. These nineteenth century publications of the Exchequer and Treasury records, which were printed in their original form and language, greatly simplified any study of financial affairs in Scotland, but neither George Burnett nor Thomas Dickson in their respective prefaces to the Exchequer Rolls and the Accounts of the Treasurer made much attempt at analysing the figures recorded in the various accounts included in these volumes nor was there much effort to extract information concerning the organisation and procedure of the Exchequer. In fact Burnett provided little more than a series of articles on the political, military and diplomatic events which occurred within the scope of each volume. Even Dickson's authoritative introduction to the first volume of The Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer has presented only a resumé of some of the principal entries contained within the first volume but again there was only limited information about the financing of the various aspects of royal government. However, the recent publication of the twelfth volume of the treasurers' accounts provided not only a worthwhile analysis of the fiscal administration since the reign of James I but also, more specially, there was a long overdue attempt to associate composition receipts for feudal casualties and escheats with the letters of gift recorded in the Register of the Privy Seal.

---

4. RSS, i, 1546.

Concerning the rolls of local accountants, the oldest original rolls represented those of the custumar and the burgh baillie - the latter appearing on the back, 'in dorso', of the accounts of the former official - dated from 1326. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries these accounts continued relatively complete. Only a few sheriffs' rolls have survived for the late Mediaeval period. In addition to the four series of sheriffs' accounts for the later Middle Ages, certain accounts, audited in 1489, are preserved unpublished in the Scottish Record Office. Those of the property accountants, the Ballivi ad Extra, are almost wholly complete from 1450. The lack of an permanent royal demesne before 1424 reduced the need for such officials, but the spectacular acquisition of property from the return of James I resulted in the proliferation of annual accounts of those appointed to administer these estates. The first Ballivi ad Extra accounts dated from 1434 and from that date until 1450 the survival of these rolls was rather haphazard. However, from the mid fifteenth century only a few accounts are missing. Associated with the property rolls were the rental books, 'Rentalia Domini Regis', which were recorded in the Appendix of the Exchequer Rolls from 1480. Unfortunately, the survival rate of the accounts of the officials at the centre of the financial administration was not as high as the local accountants, for, until the reign of James IV, only one treasurer's roll and two short comptrollers' accounts have remained.[5] However, from 1492 there was a semblance of continuity in the accounts of the comptroller. Since the printing of these nineteenth century compilations, three additional accounts of comptroller, sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch, for the period 1495 to 1499, were traced and published in the ninth volume of the Miscellany of the Scottish History Society in 1958. From 1488 until 1513, only a few

---

5. The account of treasurer, the bishop of Glasow, dated from August 1473 to December 1474. Of the early comptrollers' accounts, that of Alexander Napier lasted for almost a whole year prior to mid summer 1450 and that of George Shoriswood, in the absence of Alexander Nairn, absent in England, accounted for the receipts of only a few months.

years were not covered by the treasurers' rolls. Earlier, during the regency of the two dukes of Albany, there was a complete series of chamberlains' accounts. In addition to these printed accounts, there have survived to the present day isolated unpublished records associated with royal finances; during the latter part of James IV's reign, the two household books, 'Libri Domicilii Regis' and the 'Libri Emptorum Regis' which provided invaluable information about the acquisition and purchase of daily supplies for the royal household and the customs books and the books of entries of ships which were vital for any understanding of the organisation of the export trade and the methods employed to extract revenue from this trade. In addition, the later documents provided evidence of the nature and distribution of the merchandice which was exported from Scotland, the origin of vessels transporting these goods and the names of the principal exporters.

Other public records have supplied useful supplementary datae. The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland provided interesting and valuable information concerning the forfeiture of property and the contemporary attitude to such topics as feuing, trade, taxation and coinage, the judicial records, the Acts of the Lords of the Council in Civil Causes and the Acts of the Lords Auditors, were important for the evidence of proceedings involving the non payment of crown revenue, disputes over royal leases, controversies over feudal incidents and the withholding of pensions and other payments while the Registers of the Great and Privy Seals included charters dealing with the alienation of sections of the royal demesne, letters relating to the gift of remission from royal justice and of feudal casualties, feu charters and letters of lease, various royal appointments and cutoms remissions. Private secular and ecclesiastical muniments, both published and unpublished, bequeathed a selection of writs, charters and letters which occasionally provided interesting information related to the finances of the crown. These documents provided examples of royal discharges for payments to fiscal officials, the means of paying compositions for the

technical offences of recognition and non-entry, retours which provided an invaluable guide as to the changing value of real estate and other interesting scraps of information. The Morton collection of muniments have supplied the historian of the late Middle Ages with two unique rentals of the regality of Dalkeith, useful for comparison with the management and exploitation of the royal estates. In addition, certain collections furnished some insight into the struggles between the crown and private landowners over the ownership of particular estates, for instance, the Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff printed vital information ooncerning the protracted dispute over the fate of the earldom of Mar in the 1440s and 1450s while the Swintons of that Ilk, supplied evidence about the controversy over the lands of Cranshaws in the earldom of March.

Certain ecclesiastical cartularies contained some additional information concerning the leasing of spiritual estates while the burgh records of Edinburgh and Aberdeen provided information about trade and prices and also the increasing gulf between the feufarm and the actual revenue collected by the burgh baillies. Mediaeval chroniclers tended to be confined to political, diplomatic and military affairs and little concerned with financial details and even Buchanan's tirade against the exploitation of the casualty of recognition by William Elphinstone was based on his dislike of the absolutist style of government.

Although there is much information to be gleaned from both public and private muniments the official language contained in these records frequently concealed many additional, and often more interesting, features. Because of the reliance on official sources in Scotland in the later Middle Ages, it is extremely difficult to delve beneath these documents in order to gain a truer impression of activity at the grass roots and of events leading to the various official decisions. In succeeding centuries, the proliferation of private letters and more records of the intricacies of estate management and the financial administration presented the historian with a more complete

set of documentary evidence.

The dramatic increase in documentation in the later Middle Ages was largely a response to the rising demand for written proof of owernship and payment. Exchequer Rolls and other financial records were preserved not only for their historical value but also for more practical purposes. Contemporaries understood the worth of these documents and, in cases of fiscal disputes, the rolls were produced to settle the controversy. On 30 April 1501 a chest containing the Exchequer Rolls was transported from Edinburgh castle, where they were stored, in order to provide Robert Colville, the director of the chancery, with information concerning the past history of the royal property of Burnturk in connection with the feu claim of Walter Heriot.[6] 'In order to ascertain the date of the last account of the burgh farms of Kintore and Fyvie, in 1501 a search was made in the appropriate rolls as far back as 1332 before any record of an account of these burgh baillies was discovered.[7] In an action pursued by the crown against Robert Douglas of Lochleven, Alexander Seaton of Parbroath, David Barcley and others over their part in the serving of a brieve of inquest purchased by John Cunningham concerning the lands of We$t Barns and Gallowside the Lords of the Council instructed the clerk of the register to 'pas and seik the ald Chekkar Rollis to se geif only declaracioun can be had to schaw mare clerely how the sammyn landis are haldin, for his Hienis wald nowther be hurt himself in his heritage nor have the saide Johne skaithit contrar ressoun'.[8]

The proliferation of charters and royal letters inevitably resulted

---

6. TA, ii, 105. RMS, iii, 2593.

7. ER, xi, 384.

8. ADC, ii, cxx. The tutors of John Cunningham claimed that the lands were held in blanchfarm and were, therefore, liable for ward and relief.

in a confusion of rights. The settlement of disputed claims was achieved by the production of the written evidence possessed by both parties. On 20 July 1498 Alexander Gordon, the sheriff depute of Kirkcudbright, and William McLellan disputed the escheat of the late Donald McGill, the former asserted that he had compounded with the treasurer, George, abbot of Paisley, for the gift 'and thareapone producit ane writing subscrivit with the sadis Tresauraris handis' while the latter produced a letter of gift under the king's signet. The decision of the Lords of the Council was that both documents 'be of nane avail, force nor effect in tyme tocum' because McLellan's letter should have been under the king's privy seal nor the signet while Gordon's composition of £2 was far below the value of the escheat.[9] On 20 February 1497-8 the lands of Kincraigie in the lordship of Cromar were claimed by John Meldrum in liferent through a gift from James III under the great and Alexander Gordon of Midmar was produced a letter of tack under the privy seal for a specific rent 'til be payit be him heirely to our soverand Lordis Comptrollare, and allowit yeirely in the Chekkar rollis' and he was instructed to prove that he has submitted the farm annually.[10]

The increasing demand for written evidence as the principal means of successfully asserting a claim not unnaturally resulted in the production of dubious documents. On 15 February 1499-1500 Margaret Spittall produced her letter of tack to the assise herring of the East Sea but the lords adjourned the case until 3 July 'til produce the writare that wrat the sade letter because it was allegyit by the sade Maister James, the king's advocate, that the last lyne contenit in the sammyn letter was part suspect and was nocht writtin the tyme that the remanent of the sade letter was writin'.[11]

---

9. ADC, ii, 284-5.

10. ADC, ii, 115. These allowances were recorded in 1484, 1488, 1495 and 1497. ER, ix, 281, x, 15, 515, xi, 20.

11. ADC, ii, 397.

The Exchequer was as the centre of the Scottish financial administration. In contrast to the system employed in Mediaeval England, the Scottish Exchequer was the sole organ of financial government, corresponding to the English Upper Exchequer - there was no Scottish equivalent to the Lower Exchequer south of the border. However, it would be true to say that, despite the superficial similarities, the Scottish Exchequer was an extremely primitive department with only a few of the methods used in the English Upper Exchequer. The organisation of the Scottish Exchequer, which bore certain similarities to that of the English of the twelfth century, altered little between the reforms of 1424 and the changes undertaken during the reign of Mary.

Even by current Mediaeval standards, the Scottish Exchequer was an extremely amateurish organisation. It was far from a permanent institution, the venue varied considerably, often according to the location of the royal court, and the date of the annual audit, although normally in mid summer after the termination of the Whitsun term, could also be held at other times of the year. For instance, the audit of the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra between 29 January 1498-9 and 26 February 1499-1500 were held at four different venues, at Edinburgh at the former date, at Linlithgow from 19 to 22 June 1499, at Inverness on 30 October and Stirling from 16 June 1499 to 26 February 1499-1500.[12] The Lords Auditors, drawn from the larger body of the Lords of the Council, were appointed only for the duration of the audit and were relieved of their duties after they had completed their task. This body of officials was derived from a cross section of the king's councillors, those of high estate, whose presence reflected the prevailing political climate, tended to attend only when matters of considerable importance were under review, while the professional civil servants would have been in constant attendance and dealt with the routine business of the Exchequer. In 1487, for instance, the auditors appointed to hear the annual accounts from

---

12. ER, xi, xii.

25 June consisted of William Schevez, archbishop of St. Andrews, Colin, earl of Argyll, Andrew, lord Avandale, John Ramsey, lord Bothwell and John, lord Carlyle who made up the former category of auditors while Alexander Scott, master Alexander Inglis, James Allardice, Henry Alan, Richard Roberts, the comptroller and the treasurer would have attended to the actual details of the audit and, finally, William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, who might well have represented both sections of this body.[13] The actual number of auditors appointed for each year varied considerably. The physical transcription of the various rolls was under the direction of the clerk of the register who was the principal clerk of the Exchequer, under whom other clerks were employed for the keeping and writing of the rolls. By 1503 there were three such clerks, one of whom was Henry Mair who had served in that capacity since 1476.[14] In 1499 there is mention of a chaplain of the Exchequer[15] andnine minstrels were also present at an annual audit.[16] The cost of the Exchequer was borne by the chamberlain until 1424 and subsequently by the comptroller. In 1492 the comptroller received an allowance for the expenses of the auditors for the period from 26 June to 26 July which amounted to £125 in bread, ale, wine, mutton, marts, poultry, fish and 'uncosts', excluding other provisions supplied by the chamberlain of Fife.[17] In addition, the comptroller sustained the cost of Exchequer equipment, including tables, stools, counters and cloth coverings. Although the king's presence seems to have been unusual there is ample evidence to show that he occasionally was in attendance and was probably available for consultation. One of the accusations levelled against the Boyds by

---

13. ER, ix, 459.

14. ER, viii, 383, xii, 120. Mair containued to copy Exchequer Rolls as late as 1518. ER, xiv, 357.

15. ER, xi, 260.

16. ER, xiii, 122.

17. ER, x, 378.

James III during their trial before Parliament was 'the treasonable taking of our royal person at the time of our being in our Exchequer in our burgh of Linlithgow' on 9 July 1466.[18]

The actual organisation of the annual audit of the Exchequer seems to have been extremely unprofessional and haphazard. Although it is known that local Ballivi ad Extra, custumars and burgh baillies were summoned to appear at the Exchequer on an appointed date, there seems little logic in what occurred at the audit. Taking the 1507 audit, which stretched from 12 July to 30 August, as an example, there is no obvious pattern either in the order of accounts or the number heard in one day. For instance, on 2 August the accounts of the chamberlains of Moray and Stirlingshire and also the custumar of Dumbarton were rendered, with the result, there would appear to be no geographical sequence. However, the three accounts of Alexander, lord Hume as chamberlain of Ettrick forest, March and Haliburton were rendered on 11, 13, 14 August. Also, the number of accounts heard in one day seems to have varied considerably; on 11 August Ballivi ad Extra accounts for Ettrick forest, the grange of Dunbar and Galloway, the custumar account for Kirkcudbright and the burgh baillie accounts for Kirkcudbright and Wigtown were recorded while on 5 August the auditors investigated only the simple burgh baillie accounts of Lauder and Jedburgh. In addition to the accounts investigated during the time of the audit, on 13 and 14 September the two late accounts of the feuar of Glencairny and the chamberlain of Kintyre were rendered before the same auditors.[19] It is clear that all the details contained in a particular account were not considered by the auditors, for, although new allowances, customs books and any points of controversy would be reviewed by the auditors, many of the entries in the rolls would require only scant attention. There seems little doubt that

---

18. APS, ii, 186.

19. See Appendix No.B/1 (a).

large portions of these accounts were accepted without question if they had appeared in previous accounts. Thus, the accounts involving considerable sums of money did not necessarily consume the most time at the audit.

Until 1424, the principal receiver of royal revenue was the great chamberlain but the dominance this office achieved under the aegis of the House of Albany, the most powerful baronial faction during the captivity of James I, forced the king on his return to Scotland to reduce the fiscal powers of that office. In place of the chamberlain at the apex of the fiscal administration, James I substituted two officials, the comptroller and treasurer. The division of royal receipts involved the comptroller in the collection of income from crown property, fixed payments by royal burghs as dictated by their feu charters and the great customs while, in the mid sixteenth century James Makgill and John Bellenden outlined the treasurer's responsibilities as including 'general intromissions and charge over the casualties, which consist of the rights and profits which fall to the crown by accident and chance; such as wards, reliefs, non-entries to vacant lands, profits of marriages, also compositions given by the king's authority for infeftments in lands sold or resigned ... into the king's hands; all the revenue of moveable goods escheated to the crown by confiscation and execution of justice in criminal causes; likewise the compositions made for remissions and pardons of offences; similarly the goods of unlegitimated bastards and others who die without heirs; also the temporal fruits and revenues of hishoprics, when vacant and until intimation of the bulls of provision thereof; finally the profits which may arise from mines and from the coinage'.[20] However, the split in responsibility between these two officials was not so clear cut in the early fifteenth century, for, in 1438 the treasurer was recorded as receiving revenue from the royal burghs

---

20. Makgill and Bellenden, Discours Particulier D'Escosse, Bannatyne Club.

and great customs while in 1450 the comptroller, Alexander Napier, received a large portion of revenue from feudal incidents and royal justice.[21] It seems likely that after the lapse of the office of comptroller between 1461 and 1464 the two financial officials tended to confine their interest to the portions of royal income which they dealt with in the sixteenth century.

Both the treasurer and the comptroller accepted their receipts from local accountants or private individuals who paid their levies directly to the central functionary. Receipts were charged to the comptroller and treasurer 'according to the rolls', 'per rotulos', or 'in the Exchequer', 'in scaccario', according to the 'responsiones' entered in the rolls of the local fiscal officials, which related the amount which had been received by either the comptroller or the treasurer for which the latter would subsequently answer. For the sake of convenience each 'responsio' was entered in the margin opposite the record of the payment in question. Receipts were also made 'outwith the rolls', 'extra rotulos', for which there was no record in the accounts of the local official for that year.[22]

Beneath the comptroller and the treasurer were a series of local accountants, the Ballivi ad Extra, who administered the financial affairs of the royal demesne, custumars, burgh baillies and sheriffs, who were all appointed by the crown. In theory, they were bound to make annual account of all the royal receipts due within the scope of their jurisdiction but it was common for many accountants to bring their rolls to the Exchequer at irregular intervals. For instance, in 1498 the account of the burgh baillies of Aberdeen rendered at Edinburgh by the provost, sir John Rutherford, covered a total of eighteen years in which time receipts of £3,840 had to be cleared by the auditors.[23] The jurisdiction of each accountant was carefully

---

21. ER, v, 39, 391-6.

22. ER, xii, 178-9. TA, i, 217.

23. ER, xi, 130. Not unnaturally, there was a substantial rest at the foot of the account, amounting to £835-6-8.

guarded in order that he was not charged with the collection of revenue for which he had no mandate to receive and which was outwith the sphere of his responsibility. In 1456, David, earl of Crawford, sheriff of Aberdeen, disclaimed responsibility for the collection of the ward of the barony of Kingedward, in the king's hands for a total of three years before the earl of Ross had taken the sasine since the farms had been charged to Richard Forbes and Alexander Young, then chamberlains of the king's property north of the Spey who were to answer for the sums involved.[24]

At the grass roots of the royal financial administration, information is extremely scanty, but it is clear that although royal officials did perform many of the mundane tasks of their office, deputies and servants were frequently employed to attend to many of the details. There can be little doubt that most of the aristocratic sheriffs and Ballivi ad Extra, although retaining ultimate responsibility for the revenue within their jurisdiction, did not personally collect the cash. However, professional officials probably participated to a greater extent in the actual affairs of their charge. The demand of outside interests compelled the appointment of deputies to perform the routine tasks of many of these fiscal offices. In 1512 the account of the chamberlain of Fife, James, archbishop of Glasgow, was rendered in Edinburgh by his deputy, Andrew Mathieson.[25] On 8 March 1507-8 Andrew, bishop of Moray was appointed for life to the office of chamberlain of the lordship of Moray with the power 'to mak deputis under him, ane or maa, in the said office' and also to the charge of custumar of the area north of the Spey for which he was granted the right to 'mak factouris, substitutis and clerkis of coket'.[26] Although much of the business in

---

24. ER, vi, 158. John, earl of Ross was permitted by the king to legally enter his possessions before he had attained his majority.

25. ER, xiii, 422.

26. RSS, i, 1629, 1630.

connection with receiving revenue and purchasing supplies for the royal household were actually performed by the comptroller in person, the sheer scale of his duties necessitated the employment of servants. In 1509, sir Duncan Forrester, comptroller, was allowed £80 from his own account in recompense for his labours and expenses purchasing marts and victuals at various fairs and collecting farms due to the crown.[27] In 1511-12 large sums of money due to the receiver-general, Andrew, bishop of Caithness, were in fact delivered to his assistant, David Stewart.[28]

Although the rolls frequently recorded the payment of a single lump sum from the local accountant to the comptroller, such submissions were mostly made in several instalments. In 1506 sir Walter Ogilvy of Aboyne, chamberlain of Petty and Brackley, submitted a total of £137-6-10 to the comptroller, James Redheuch and payment was verified before the auditors on the production of various quittances issued by Redheuch.[29] However, the evidence suggests that a considerable amount of paper work was involved in these transfers of revenue from local to central officials. In the first half of the fifteenth century, it is likely that the Ballivi ad Extra actually collected from the various tenants most of the cash recorded in his charge but in the reign of James IV, with the tendancy towards both larger and longer leases, it seems that royal tenants with substantial holdings paid their annual farms direct to the comptroller. In 1505 the account of Robert Rankin, chamberlain of the earldom of Moray, recorded that comptroller, John Stirling, had received £166-10s of the farms of the lands of Glencairny and Abernethy for the first term of this account and for the two previous terms and that James Redheuch comptroller at the time of the audit, had

---

27. ER, xiii, 260.

28. ER, xiii, 402-478.

29. ER, xii, 416.

received a further £55-10s for the term of Whitsun, directly from the tenant, John Grant.[30] Also, in 1487, although the chamberlain of Stirlingshire was charged with the farms of the propert of Larbertshiels, payment of the annual rent was made directly to the comptroller by the lessee, Malcolm Forester.[31] For the sake of administrative convenience, the chamberlain of Moray was still charged with these farms until 1505 when Grant accounted for the revenue on his own behalf.[32] This trend was undoubtedly fostered by the grant of the office of bailliery to many substantial crown lessees.[33] It is noticeable that, even in the local rolls, revenue paid into the comptroller's accounts was assigned for some particular purpose. For instance, £21-11-4 was submitted to the comptroller from the receipts of the chamberlain of Petty and Brackley in 1506 'through the receipt of Thomas, head cook of the king ... for certain expenses incurred at Inverness'. It is doubtful if the cash involved was actually delivered to the comptroller or whether this represented paper work and the cook received his expenses locally.[34] In 1487 it was stated in the account of James Shaw of Sauchie, chamberlain of Stirlingshire, that a total of £142-14-6 was received by James Redheuch for the expenses of the prince in Stirling although the comptroller was to answer for the cash.[35] Not only did Redheuch receive the revenue directly from Shaw but also it seems probable that entries recorded in this fashion represented some sort of prior assignment.

The date of the commencement of the annual audit of accounts was fixed

---

30. ER, xii, 287.

31. ER, ix, 483, 632.

32. ER, xii, 575.

33. RSS, i, 866. ER, x, 637.

34. ER, xii, 416.

35. ER, ix, 483.

at least six weeks in advance and accountants were entitled to receive a prior warning of proceedings of forty days. Percepts or brieves of summons were sent to the sheriffs ordering them to appear themselves and also they were to warn all other royal financial officials within the shire to appear. The earliest brieve is dated 13 May 1437 in which the sheriff of Aberdeen was required to appear at the Exchequer at Stirling on 3 July with the continuation of days and be prepared to render his account before the auditors for all the farms and returns from wards, reliefs, marriages, fines, escheats, the profit from his own court, to transport with him the extract from both the justice and chamberlain ayres and all other levies within his jurisdiction with which he was charged. In addition, he was also ordered to account for the proceeds of a contribution voted for the journey of the king's sister to France and also to inform all the burgh provosts and baillies, custumars and especially the baillies of the royal demesne and intromitters with lands held in ward of the day and place of the audit of their accounts.[36] Since accountants were ordered to appear at a specific time it would seem that some timetable of business was organised. In 1506 a royal proclamation required 'all his officeris, liegis and subditis that aw compt in the said chekkir that thai compere before the lordis auditouris therof the said xv day of Junii witht continaucioun of dais to give compt, reknyn and payment of all dewites awin of termez digane sen ther last compt efter the tenore of the preceptis to be direct therapoun under all pane and charge that efter may follow'.[37] The Exchequer normally lasted six to eight weeks, but in 1501 the audit which began on 15 June did not terminate until 18 January 1501-2.[38] Accountants who failed to appear on the appointed day were liable for a fine of £10 but this penalty was irregularly enforced and was mostly incurred by burgh baillies and sheriffs. Total or

---

36. SRO, Lord Forbes Papers, No. 1.

37. ADC, xviii, f 196.

38. ER, xi, XVI.

partial remission of the fine was common. In 1487 the burgh baillies of Irvine owed a fine of £30 for failure to attend the audits for the years 1483, 1484 and 1485, half of which was remitted and the remainder expended by the auditors on drink.[39] However, many royal financial officials, especially the Ballivi ad Extra, remainded absent from the Exchequer for long periods without incurring massive fines.

The basis of the accounting procedure which operated in Mediaeval Scotland was that all royal receivers were personally responsible for all the revenue due to the crown which was recorded in the charge side of their accounts. The accountant was held liable not only for the cash he actually received but also for 'fictitious revenue', that is income which never, in fact, reached the hands of the particular official but for which he had to satisfy the auditors of its destination. For instance, during the reign of James IV both the sheriffs and the treasurer were held accountable for certain feudal incidents although many such entries passed through the formers' accounts purely as paper work. It was possible to transfer liability for a specific sum of money by means of an indenture, a practice frequently employed by the sheriff. In 1501 the £10 fine of Robert Boyd, charged to the sheriff of Dumbarton, was directed through an indenture to the sheriff of Lanark, the receipt of which the latter acknowledged in writing.[40] Even if the revenue concerned was illegally detained by royal tenants or exporters, it was the responsibility of the accountant to enforce payment or recompense the crown from his own pocket. In 1490, the chamberlain of Cowall was ordered to collect certain outstanding farms 'under the pain of payment of the said sum out of his own goods'[41] while in 1504 the

---

39. ER, ix, 550.

40. ER, xi, 345[x]. The reason for the transfer was that Boyd had no distrainable goods within the jurisdiction of the sheriff of Dumbarton.

41. ER, x, 180.

sheriff of Wigtown was ordered to 'distrenye the souertes that he tuke for the said releif and gif he tuke na suretes ... incontrare the forme of the precept direct to him therapoun that he stand dettour be him self for the principale soume of the king because of his negligence'.[42] The accountant was to answer at the Exchequer for all the entire revenue recorded in his charge and was personally liable for all the sums which either remained unpaid or he not been satisfactorily accounted for before the auditors and he or his heirs were pursued for the arrears even after his dismissal or death. In 1502 and again in 1504, Michael Lindsay of Fairgirth accounted for the arrears of his father as chamberlain of Galloway.[43] However, the present fiscal officer was not responsible for the arrears of his predecessors. In 1480, for instance, George Maxwell of Garnsalloch, the receiver of the lordship of Bothwell, was not charged with the arrears of William Simpson, the bishop of Glasgow and James, lord Hamilton, previous holders of the office since he had no mandate to raise their outstanding sums.[44] However, should the accountant be unable to extract the outstanding sums from royal debtors, the former was entitled to resort to diligence against the goods of the offenders. The retention of cash and grain farms by Kenneth McKenzie, John Munro, master Thomas Ross, William Ross and Thomas Reid compelled the chamberlain of Ross in 1486 to seek royal permission to be able to poind both the lands and the goods of the offenders for all the revenue recorded in the rest at the foot of his account. Also, in the same account, it was recorded that Hugh, lord Lovat had pledged his lands to the king as security for the payment of over £74 in cash and a quantity of

---

42. ADC, xv, f 202.

43. ER, xii, 62, 228. The last account of master James Lindsay as chamberlain of Galloway ended on 12 April 1497 and who died sometime before January 1499-1500. ER, xi, 108, 189.

44. ER, ix, 6.

barley, meal, oats and mutton by Kenneth McKenzie, farms from royal property in Ross for the years 1479, 1480 and 1481 but the outstanding sums were obviously not forthcoming since the lands of lord Lovat were apprized for the debt.[45] However, the accountant's efforts at distraint were not always successful in relieving him of his responsibility to the crown, principally because the debtor was in a position to be able to resist such encroachments or else employing the excuse of having no goods to frustrate this type of action. Not infrequently the accountant's attempts at recovering outstanding royral revenue were resisted by force. In the 1487 account of the chamberlain of Galloway, certain sums of money totalling £213 were depending on Roland, Gilbert and Thomas Kennedy, John, lord Kennedy, Richard Heres, John Gordon of Lochinver and others, the farms of royal property within Galloway illegally withheld by these persons, who had deforced the chamberlain when poinding for the rents 'upon which sums pending and deforcements the Lords of the Council decreed letters to be directed to the steward of Kirkcudbright, the sheriff of Wigtown and the accountant, to levy all the goods of these deforcers and bring them in to the king's use, with which the accountant is to be charged after the distraint and inbringing'.[46] The accountant could also call on the royal debtor to relieve him 'at the king's hands' of responsibility for the collection of a particular debt. In 1504 Michael Lindsay of Fairgirth, heir to his father's arrears as chamberlain of Galloway, was allowed £36 by the auditors for the farms of the lands of Barskeauch since Hugh Campbell of Craigie, heir of John Wallace of Craigie, who had occupied the lands in question, took the sum upon himself and was to be charged with it in his next account as baillie of Kyle.[47] Accountants frequently had to resort to

---

45. ER, ix, 405-7.

46. ER, ix, 462.

47. ER, xii, 229.

judicial proceedings in order to recover royal debts. On 31 January, James Douglas of Pittendreich, the former chamberlain of Moray, successfully pursued an action against Alexander Innes of that ilk for the withholding of 17 barrels of salmon from the Spey fishing.[48]

The accountant was also liable for the activities of his deputies. On 27 May 1503 Alexander Bannerman of Waterton, sheriff depute to John, earl of Crawford in the shire of Aberdeen, was ordered to relieve the earl 'at the king's hands' of £880, the arrears of his account rendered in 1502. The decree was granted to the earl because Bannerman had already granted a bond of relief in his favour and was, therefore, bound to keep the earl 'harmelss and scaithless of the sammyn at oure soverane lordis handis, as ses sufficientlie previt be the said Alexanderis letterez obligatouris undir his seile and subscripcioun manuall maid to the said Johne thairupoun inlikwis schawin and producit befor the saidis lordis'.[49] This represented a private arrangement between the earl and Mannerman but it did not diminish the former's own liability to the king for the £880.

Despite these avenues of action, the accountant was not totally relieved of his responsibility, as far as the auditors were concerned, until he had received a letter of discharge from the crown. Concerning the arrears amassed by James Douglas of Pittendreich as chamberlain of Moray from the date of his entry until 26 January 1484-5, amounting to £166-15-10, 43 chalders of wheat, 10 chalders of barley, 44 marts and the same number of mutton and 3 lasts, 2 barrels of salmon, Douglas compounded with the comptroller for a lump payment of £160 cash. Following this settlement, the king issued a letter of discharge under the privy seal to Douglas stating that he had

---

48. ADC, xii, f 72.

49. ADC, xiv,, f 158.

made yearly account to the Exchequer, had paid a composition for his rest and was therefore absolved from all further responsibility for the period prior to that date, and also that 'we charge the auditouris of oure chekker that las was and sal happin to be for the tyme that thai mak the saidis restis dependand apon the said James in the fute of his last compt to be dischargit and allowit to him efter the tenour of thir oure lettrez'.[50] A letter of discharge was only granted by the crown to a royal official when the king was satisfied that full payment of the sums in question had been achieved. Final clearance of the debt might be considerably delayed. For instance,on 1 January 1512, George Robinson, the son of the late George Robinson, comptroller at the time of James III, was finally discharged of the outstanding sum of £658-3-4 'and of all uther soumez, dettis and clamez that his grace may ony wise ask or craif at the handis of the said George'. It was related that Robinson's land, tenement, foreland and bakeland within the burgh of Edinburgh was apprized for the debt and since 'his Grace haldis hym wele content and pait be the said George' the king 'grantis and decernis the foresaid hald land lauchfully redemit within the space of vii zeriz efter the apprising of the sammyn' and Robinson was given the power to intromit and dispose of the profits of the lands 'ale fre and siclike as thai mycht haif done before the said apprixing'.[51]

The formation of these Mediaeval accounts was based on the 'charge' and the 'discharge'. However, it should be noted that both the 'charge' and the 'discharge' bore little resemblance to actual receipts and payments but merely reflected the sums for which the accountant was held responsible to the crown. The charge side of an accountant could vary from year to year or be a fixed annual sum. Concerning the former, the charge recorded in the

---

50. ER, ix, 312-6.

51. RSS, i, 2461.

custumars' accounts varied in size according to the volume of trade passing through each port and similarly those of the comptroller and treasurer tended to vary in line with the size of the receipts from local accountants within the duration of a particular account and also according to the unpredictable nature of feudal casualties, escheats and judicial profits. On the other hand, most of the royal burghs submitted a fixed annual feufarm as laid down in the charter while, from the second half of the fifteenth century, the tendancy was for the charge side of the property rolls to remain fixed for long periods. In 1497, William Drummond, chamberlain of Strathearn was charged with the entire farms within his jurisdiction as detailed in the rolls of 1484 while the gross farm for which the chamberlain of Menteith was liable was based on the particulars recorded in the rolls of 1478.[52] Under such arrangements, the need to preserve past rolls was obvious. Even when the charge varied annually, its extent was based on the figures detailed in records produced by the accountant, namely customs books, the extracts from the justice ayres and sheriff court books.

Nowhere is the conservatism of the financial system more apparent than in the charge side of the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra. Its tendancy towards rigidity resulted in the emergence of a gulf between the figures recorded in the charge and the actual rents registered in the king's rental books. In 1480, for instance, the chamberlain of Menteith was forced to seek allowance of £12 for the farms of Westerbrigend, Duffus, Duchry and other property since the lands were assigned for forest, a further allowance of £1 for half the part of Doune, that particular estate had not been leased and 10 marks was deducted from the farms of Balquhidder charged to the chamberlain, as the lessees, William Stewart and Malcom Maclery, held the lands in lease at a reduced rent.[53] Unlike the rentals, the charge of the Ballivi ad Extra

---

52. ER, x, 566, 578.

53. ER, ix, 40.

tended to remain unaffected by the constant changes in the economic potential of different portions of royal property. The appearance of a specific entry in an accountant's charge did not necessarily mean that the latter had actually received the cash involved. In 1509 the comptroller, Duncan Forrester, was charged with £238-8-7 from Alexander, lord Hume as chamberlain of Ettrick forest but instead of the actual cash the comptroller only received Hume's obligation to pay.[54] Such obligations were frequently left unfulfilled even by the time the comptroller was called upon to account. For instance, in order to clear his rests from his previous accounts as chamberlain of Ettrick forest and the earldom of March, in 1503, Alexander, lord Hume compounded with the comptroller, John Stirling, for the sum of £454, of which £300 was paid in cash and for the remainder Hume presented the comptroller with a letter of obligation. In the 1503 account of John Stirling, the entire £454 was inserted in his charge but, on 7 September, it was stated that lord Hume was obliged to pay John Stirling the sum of £154 between now and next Martinmas 'becaus the said comptrollare tuke the sammyn upoun him as payment of the said Alexanderis rest of his compt of the Forest, to the payment of quhilk soume of £154 he bond him in the sikkerest form'.[55] In contrast, however, the figures recorded in the treasurers' charge represented the money which that official had actually received. The part of the composition which had not been submitted by the end of the account formed the rest which was cleared in subsequent accounts as the cash was forthcoming. In the account of James Beaton, abbot of Dunfermline ending August 1506, £30 was received by the treasurer as part payment of a composition of £50 for a charter granted to John, lord Kennedy for the lands of Coif, Ellirkenoch and Kilbreky, thus leaving a rest of £20. On 8 December 1506 the same official 'grantis us to have resavit fra schir David Kennedy, knycht, bailze of Carrik ye soume of twenty lib. usuale monee of Scotland in full payment of ye compositioun of ye

---

54. ER, xiii, 180.

55. ER, xii, 115-6, 177. ADC, xiv, f 186.

charter of resignatioun maid to Johnne, lord Kennedy' for the above lands and 'in full payment forsaid we hald us content and payit and in our soverane lordis name quittclamis and dischargis ye said schir David Kennedy for now and ever be this acquitcalme' and in the treasurer's account covering that letter of quittance the remaining £20 was listed amount the receipts.[56]

All accountants were compelled to make a verbal declaration under oath of the truth of their accounts but only in entries of special significance were such undertakings specifically recorded. In 1486 Richard Richardson, custumar of the burgh of North Berwick, appears at the Exchequer and confessed that no customs had been levied at that port during the year prior to the audit.[57]

The discharge was record of payments or deductions allowed to the accountant for which sufficient proof had been produced. Allowance for payment to either the comptroller or the treasurer required the production of one or more discharges from the official to whom the cash was allegedly paid. In 1510 James Dog, chamberlain of Menteith, gained an allowance in his account of £361-13s paid to the comptroller, Duncan Forrester, and payment was verified with the production of various letters of quittance from the comptroller at the audit.[58]

For all 'expenses' set against the accountant's charge, the latter was required to provide the auditors with proof of the legality of the payment or deduction. Allowances sought only for a single year, that is 'hac vice tantum' or 'hoc anno tantum', necessitated only the king's letter under his signet and subscription or a precept under the hand of the comptroller, treasurer or some other person in authority. This undoubtedly provided

---

56. TA, iii, 19, 224. SRO, Aila Muniments, GD 25/9, Box 23A.

57. ER,ix, 438.

58. ER, xiii, 325.

the crown with a quick and convenient method of dispensing royal patronage, but, during a period of the political dominance of a particular faction, especially during a royal minority, single payments to supporters from crown revenue were simply arranged. In 1448, for instance, James Walker received a payment of £4 from the customs of Edinburgh through the mandate of James Livingstone, chamberlain, verified at the audit by his letters of precept.[59] During the 1440s the frequent appearance of members of the Livingstone family in connection with the purchasing and witnessing of supplies bound for the king's household was indicative of the influence of that faction over royal affairs. Allowances were frequently affected by the king's intervention. In 1486, James III authorised the allowance of £9-1-2, the rent of certain property occupied by Duncan McIntosh, 'and the lord Chancellor and others of the king's council declared on the king's behalf that his will was and is that only the Martinmas term should be allowed to him and that in the future he should pay the farms for all terms.[60]

In addition to the royal warrant authorising payment the auditors also required proof of payment. Deliveries to the royal household were verified by an inspection of the various household books.[61] Although the destiny of the 26 chalders of wheat delivered to the king's bakers in 1468 was verified in the daily books analysed at the audit, concerning the 30 chalders delivered for the expenses of the household the following year, the household books were not presented for examination and the bakers, Patrick Purdy and Alexander Ambrose, were to answer personally for the supplies.[62] Other account books or bills were also produced before the audit. In 1508 the

---

59. ER, v, 308.

60. ER, ix, 390.

61. ER, viii, 97, 572.

62. ER, viii, 95-6.

treasurer paid a total of £20-13-2 to the gunner, Hans, which 'he laid doun at divers tymes for carying of the gunnis and for the gunnaris as his bill proportis'.[63] In 1453 John Balfour, captain of Faulkland castle, was paid £8-13-4 from the farms of Fife for his expenses at the time of his entry to office, and he ' acknowledged receipt upon the compt'.[64]

The poet, William Dunbar, presented an invaluable insight not only into the working of the Scottish Exchequer but into the rather haphazard and unsatisfactory nature of some of the accounts which were brought before the auditors. The poem gives Dunbar's explanation of the fate of 'ane soume of money for to wair' from the treasurer and his inability to provide a detailed account of the manner in which it was expended.

'My Lordis of Chacker, pleis zow to heir
My coumpt, I sall it mak zow cleir,
But only circumstance or sonzie;
Far left is nether corce nor cunzie
Off all that I tuik in the zeir.

For rekkyning of my rents and roumes,
Ze neid nocht for to tyre zour thowmes;
Na, for to gar zour countaris cluick,
Nor paper for to spend, nor ink,
In the ressaueing of my soumes.

I tuik fra my Lord Tresaurair
Ane soume of money for to wair:
I cannocht tell zow how it is spendit,
Bot weill I waitt that it is endit;
And that me think ane coumpt our sair!

I trowit, in tyme, quhen that I tuik it,
That lang in burgh I suld have bruikit,
Now the remanes ar eith to turss;
I have na preiff heir bot my purss,
Quhilk wald nocht be, and it war luikit.' [65]

The allowance to the accountant was sanctioned by the auditors on the production of the receipt, the personal appearance of the receiver was

---

63. TA, iii, 113.

64. ER, v, 534.

65. Poems of William Dunbar, ii, 255.

not essential. In 1490 James Douglas, the former earl of Douglas, was in receipt of £62 from the chamberlain of Kinclaven, which payment was acknowledged by his letters and quittance written by his own hand and produced before the auditors.[66] Even where no receipt or acknowledgement was forthcoming allowance was still possible 'at the accountant's risk, 'sub periculo computantis'. Since the allowance itself did not provide any conclusive proof of payment the system left itself open to abuse and fraud. At the 1495 Exchequer it was noted that the chamberlain of Moray had failed to produce several of the comptroller's precepts and although the allowance seems to have been passed the comptroller was informed of the situation.[67] Royal fiscal officials were frequently subjected to judicial proceedings with regard to the failure to make actual payment for sums which were allowed at the Exchequer. On 6 February 1499-1500 the Lords of the Council decreed that master Hugh Martin, a former comptroller, was to submit the sum of 20 marks to sir Baldred Blackadder for his fee which had been allowed to Martin in his rolls.[68] 29 January 1499-1500 was the date assigned by the Lords of the Council for sir John Rutherford, alderman of Aberdeen, 'til preif sufficientle that he has deliverit the sade James (that is, James Douglas, the former comptroller) acquietance allegit to be gevin to him as comptrollar for the tyme to the sade aldirman of the payment of the soume of xiij merkis in part of payment of borow malis of Abirdene' and, on the failure of Rutherford to appear before the Lords, the latter was ordered to pay Douglas the outstanding amount. However, from the evidence displayed in the accounts of the baillies of Aberdeen it would appear that allowance had been received

---

66. ER, x, 183.

67. ER, x, 523.

68. ADC, ii, 379.

by the baillies of the burgh for the 13 marks from the farms of 1490 and that sometime before July 1498 sir Duncan Forrester seems to have accepted payment of the sum involved.[69] The use of bonds as a means of delaying the actual payment and the system of allowances in accounting procedure seems to have resulted in considerable confusion. On 22 March 1497-8 John Leslie of Wardris, the son of James III's comptroller, Alexander Leslie, and John Dempsterson, the former chamberlain of Brechin were in dispute as to the fate of £37-9-4 which the former claimed was due to him through letters of obligation issued by Dempsterson to his father and which had been allowed to Dempsterson in the Exchequer rolls as a result. By 11 December 1505 the mystery had deepened for John Leslie brought forward a bond issued under Dempsterson's seal, dated 2 August 1481, but the latter's son, Walter, alleged that the seal attached to the bond was not his fathers and was not appended with his consent.[70]

Allowances for gifts, pensions, lifegrants and other lengthy concessions required the king's warrant under the great or privy seal, usually containing a precept addressed to the auditors requiring them to allow the sum allotted in the particular account. Once marked as allowed, the allowance continued in force until revoked by the crown or until terminated by the death of the recipient. In 1486 a liferent grant of £10 annually was granted to John Meldrum, a royal servant, from the farms of the lands of Kilcraigie in Mar and verified before the auditors through the production of

---

69. ADC, ii, 370. ER, xi, 131. From the evidence available, it would appear that in the eighteen year account of the baillies of Aberdeen, rendered by Rutherford in 1498, the 13 marks were allowed to James Douglas from the burgh farms of 1490 although the actual payment was received by sir Duncan Forrester who was to answer for the amount.

70. ADC, ii, 153. ADC, xvii, f 99. There is no further record of this entry.

the king's letters under the great seal at first audit.[71] In 1481 a letter of assignation was sent to the chamberlain of Stirlingshire concerning the £20 fee payable to James Homyll which stated that the sum was to be 'wele allowit to you berly in your comptis be the auditouris of oure chekker, ye schewand thir oure lettrez anys before the saidis auditouris and registrit in oure chekker rollis and bringing the said James acquittance and ressait of the said soume yerly to scheu for your warant'.[72] On 2 July 1483 a royal precept was transmitted to the auditors of the Exchequer relating that 'it is oure will and we charge yow that ye allow and put in oure rollis of compt to the custumaris ballies of oure burowis of Abirdene, Montrose and Forfar' the hereditary pensions due to David, earl of Crawford 'raisit and tane of oure custumys and malex of oure said burowis in tymes gigane'.[74] No additional letter or warrant was required to authorise the accountant to make each year's payment or for the auditors to grant annual allowance. However, care was taken to ensure that, even with recurring allowance, that actual payment was, in fact, made. On 28 July 1513 the auditors of the Exchequer ordered Alexander Spens, intromitter with the feufarm of the burgh of Cupar, to pay the friars of St. Monan's 'thare almos aucht to thaim therof of this yere bigain betuix this and the morn at v houris efter none' or else to enter himself in ward in Edinburgh castle.[74]

It was customary for royal property, which was alienated in heritage, to be removed altogether from the charge side of the accounts. On 16 July 1502, for instance, a royal precept was directed to the auditors informing

---

71. ER, ix, 358. This concession was in exchange for Meldrum's renunciation of an earlier pension of 13 marks payable from the burgh farms of Aberdeen.

72. ER, ix, 93-4.

73. ER, ix, 227.

74. ADC, xxv, f 202.

them that the lands of Strathbran and others had been granted in mortmain to the Chapel Royal and that the feufarm payable from these estates were to be diverted to the upkeep of the clerks and 'it is oure will herfor and we charge you that ye defeis our chawmérlanis that ar chargeit with the few of the said mortifiit landis of the few thereof of all termes bigane in oure chekker rollis, thai makand payment of the samyn to the collectour of oure said chapell sen the tyme of the erectioun tharof as efferis, and that ye draw the sammyn out of our chekker rollis that nene of oure chawmerlanis be chargeit tharwith in tyme to cum'.[75] However, other heritable concessions from the royal demesne were not extracted from the Exchequer Rolls but continued to be charged to the relevant accountant who was then compelled to record an annual allowance of the sum involved. Although John, earl of Atholl and his wife Eleanor were granted hereditary possession of the forest of Cluny on 3 March 1480-1, in return for their efforts during the rebellion of the lord of the Isles, the concession does not seem to have been recognised by the auditors as the chamberlain of Kinclaven received no official allowance for the farms until 1502, although the evidence suggests that Atholl had been extracting the profits from the forest from 1470.[76] It is possible that James III regretted his hasty action and was not prepared to give official backing to any such allowance in the chamberlain's accounts and the farms formed part of the irretrievable arrears of subsequent chamberlains.[77] On January 1501-2 James IV issued a precept to the auditors charging them 'to allow and defeis in oure chekker rollis the malis and dewiteis of the said forest and landis of all termez bigane

---

75. ER, xii, 232-3.

76. ER, viii, 61.

77. ER, ix, 479. In the 1487 roll of the chamberlain of Kinclaven that the royal charter to the earl of Atholl was dated January 1481-2. There is no record of any such grant in the Register of the Great Seal.

and of all termez tocum ... registering this oure precept togidder with the principale charter apoun the bak of oure rollis, to schew for your warrant'.[78] Despite this official recognition of the concession, the chamberlain of Kinclaven continued to be charged with the farms of the forest and receive the authorised allowance. Other hereditary grants under the great seal were dealt with less favourably; the mill of Greenlaw, occupied by Roger Schoriswood in accordance with royal letters under the great seal of James III returned to the crown four years later when the king maintained that he had been 'circumvented in the granting of the said letters' and the 'ill advised' grant of the lands of Kirkandrews in Galloway to lord Monneypenny, which he retained for over ten years, was revoked by James III in 1492.[79] The tendancy for the farms payable from certain alienated estates to remain within the charge of the appropriate 'Ballivi ad Extra' was probably to enable the crown and the auditors to maintain a check on the merits and legality of these concessions and it is certainly the case that some of them were later revoked.

Many of these grants and concessions involved the accountant in a substantial amount of paper work although the cash which passed through his hands was considerably less. For instance, in the 1481 account of the chamberlain of Strathearn, the lands of Two Kinkells were charged to the accountant at an annual farm of £32 but because the property had been leased to John Young and Thomas of Dumbarton for nineteen years for an annual rent of £16, the chamberlain was forced to seek an annual allowance from the auditors for the extra £16. Because of the inflexible nature of the charge,

---

78. ER, xii, 43. On 16 May 1505 the Register of the Great Seal recorded a charter by James IV of the forest of Cluny to Andrew Stewart, son of John, earl of Atholl, with the consent of Eleanor Sinclair who had held the property in joint infeftment. RMS, ii, 2853.

79. ER, ix, 522, x, 327. Allowance was finally made in 1492.

this laborious process was required to clear the account although the actual £16 was never, in fact, handled by the royal official.[80] Most of the concessions based on the proceeds from royal property were fulfilled outwith the agency of the local Ballivi ad Extra, with the grantee normally collecting the farms directly from the tenants. Similarly, rent or grassum remissions and customs exemptions must have rarely involved the accountant beyond recording them in his account. Although exports covered by a royal exemption were still charged to the appropriate custumar as all exports from Scottish burghs were registered in the customs books on which the gross charge was based, the allowance was automatically received on production of royal letters under the signet or privy seal. However, despite the entry of exempted goods in the customs books, no actual levy was paid by the grantee.

The various deductions which appeared in the discharge side of the account of most local financial officials were mostly the result of the failure of the charge to adjust to changed situation. Overcharge, the loss of revenue through the variation between the farms recorded in the accountant's charge and those which appeared in the rental books, wasted and unlet property, served to augment the amount of paper work included in the property accounts.

One of the principal tasks assigned to the auditors was to ensure that allowances, granted only for a single year, did not become recurrent and that annual allowances did not outlive their original purpose. In 1508 the tenants of Cash in the earldom of Fife were allowed, for the king's pleasure, 1 chalder of oats in recompense for destruction of their crops by the king's deer and although no definite limit was placed on the concession it is

---

80. ER, ix, 120.

unlikely that the property still felt the effects of that disruption as late as 1542 when the allowance was still in operation.[81] In 1484 the gardener of Falkland was in receipt of an annual fee of 4 marks from the farms of the earldom of Fife but the chamberlain was instructed by the auditors to submit no future payment unless the gardener was to work in the garden and supply fruit for the king's use. However, three years later the chamberlain was to make no further payment as William Thompson, the gardener, had been dismissed.[82] The auditors were able to keep a check on royal patronage by demanding a fresh royal mandate before sanctioning the continued allowance of a specific fee or concession. In 1480 the chamberlain of Moray was ordered to halt the annual payment of £16 from the farms of royal property within the earldom to sir Alexander Dunbar of Westfield for his fee as keeper of Darnaway castle without a new mandate from the king and, as the allowance was again recorded in the 1484 accounts of the chamberlain, it would appear that the new mandate had been granted.[83] The auditors were also required to maintain a constant watch on the recurrence of allowances for waste, lands unlet or lands leased for a farm smaller than the figure recorded in the accountant's charge which were doubtless used by the latter for his own material benefit. Although initially such allowances were frequently necessary, the auditors were to periodically ensure that the reason for the allowance was still operative otherwise the benefit of the allowance was absorbed by either the local accountant or some private individual. For the lands of Cauldcoats, the chamberlain of Moray was charged an annual farm of £4, but in 1467 he was granted an allowance of the entire farm since the lands had been destroyed by flooding and, in the

---

81. ER, xiii, 8, xvii, 514.

82. ER, ix, 237, 514.

83. ER, ix, 48, 267.

following year, the property was relet at a reduced rent of £1.[84] Despite threats of obtaining no future allowance for the gap between the amount charged and the actual farm obtained in 1478 and the fact that the king's commissioners, appointed for the next lease of the earldom of Moray, were ordered to consider and review the accountant's claims for the continuance of the allowance for the lands in question in 1486, the allowance continued to be recorded in the rolls for the earldom of Moray.[85] Between 1487 and 1492 the allowance remained in operation although it was repeatedly stated that a term had been assigned for the 'revitalising' of the lands and that no action had as yet been undertaken, but after 1492 the allowance halted.[86] Although the situation was allowed to drift for a long period the auditors were eventually able to remove this burden from the accounts. Part of the problem was that it was extremely difficult to remove an allowance from the rolls once it had been entered, a further reflection of the conservative approach of the accounting system. Also it was in the interest of the accountant to maintain these allowances. In 1478, in the face of a multitude of allowances for waste and decayed rents the chamberlain of Moray was ordered by the auditors to raise the entire farms, that is, the level of farms listed in his charge, of all the lands within his jurisdiction since he would not obtain any allowance for them in the future.[87] The result was varied, the allowance for the decayed rent of the lands of Padisfield was immediately removed from the rolls, the allowance for the reduced rent of the lands of Mundoile disappeared after 1492 with no diminution in the amount charged to the chamberlain,[88] although, by 1513, the £6 gulf between

---

84. ER, vii, 496, 540.

85. ER, viii, 523-4, ix, 362.

86. ER, x, 37, 349.

87. ER, viii, 524.

88. ER, x, 349.

the £10 charged to the chamberlain and £4 actually rent paid to the chamberlain by the lessee for the lands of Knok and Atenach and the loss of the entire farm of 1 mark from Craigmill through the destruction of the mill, were still recorded in the list of allowances.[89] It is extremely difficult to differentiate between attempts at defrauding the crown on the part of the local accountant and the genuine cases of decayed rents and wastage. The case of the lands of Glencairny would appear to provide an example of the latter category. Throughout the second half of the fifteenth century it was recorded that the lordship had been leased to the Grants of Fruchie for an annual farm of £60 although the chamberlain of Moray was continually charged with £110. In 1478 the auditors demanded a new mandate from the crown before permitting the future granting of the allowance of £50 and in 1487, in the light of an inquiry into the situation and the provision of a fresh lease, the chamberlain of Moray asserted that he was unable to extract more than £60 from the lands in question.[90] Even when sir John Grant of Fruchie accounted personally at the Exchequer as feufarmer of the lands of Glencairny and the actual farm had been raised to £67, he continued to be charged at £110 annually, leaving a yearly allowance of £43.[91]

In the event of the 'charge' and the 'discharge' arriving at the same total, the account was deemed 'just and lele' and the accountant concerned obtained a royal discharge or quittance in the form of a full copy of the account called an 'eque'. On 24 February 1509-10 a royal letter of quittance, issued under the privy seal, was made out to Alexander Lauder of Blith, custumar of Edinburgh who ' has maid just compt and complete payment to us and our comptrollaris' in our name of all custumis and dewities of ouris ...

---

89. ER, xiii, 518-9.

90. ER, viii, 523-4, ix, 499.

91. ER, xii, 575-6.

sen his first entre to the said office unto the day of the date hereof, and that his comptis is examit be our comptrollaris, auditouris of chekker, baith in our chekker and utherwise, and fund just and lele; And thairfor we hald us wele content and fully pait of all our custumis etc ... ressavit be him in all tymes bigane unto the day of the date hereof, and for us and our successouris quietclamys and dischargis the said Alexander'.[92] However, inefficiency, and unrealistic nature of most charges, the loss of revenue through arbitrary occupations and failure to pay the appropriate dues and the delay in granting certain allowances resulted in the accumulation of substantial arrears, which were often still recorded even after the dismissal of that particular accountant. Arrears accounts frequently cleared most of the accountant's liability for payments or deductions which had previously been settled but for which no allowance had as yet been recorded.[93] Most of this represented only paper work but the real problem lay with the irretrievable arrears, cash for which the accountant was liable but which he was unable to collect. Such pleas were frequently used before the auditors in order to encourage them to show leniency. Although, in theory, responsible for the collection of all the farms recorded in their charge, in practice, the failure of tenants to submit their full levy, the seizure of revenue, lands in waste, unlet or suffering from decayed rents and the arbitrary occupation of certain estates by certain local magnates, all represented potential revenue on which the accountant was unable to lay his hands. The annual loss of this type of revenue usually contributed to the steady accumulation of arrears, for which there was little hope of reocvery. Allowance was sometimes given by the auditors within the account if it was finally recognised by the auditors that the case for recovery was hopeless. In 1492, for instance, allowance was given to the chamberlain of Carrick for £200, the outstanding farms of Kirkandrews from 1472 until 1482 which had been

---

92. RSS, i, 2017.

93. ER, x, 321, 568, xii, 398, xiii, 529.

wrongly occupied by William, lord Monneypenny and £227-11-4, the farms of the lands of Dundonald which had been in the hands of Alan, lord Cathcart, a certain chaplain and Gilbert, lord Kennedy for custody of Dundonald castle from 1477 until 1482 and until 1492 no allowance had been made.[94] Frequently the auditors were prepared to accept a lesser sum in lieu of the full amount owing if there was little likelihood of the latter being totally repaid. In 1494, Alexander, lord Hume, ranger of the ward of Yarrow in Ettrick forest, was permitted to submit a composition of £100 instead of the full debt of £314-13-1, 28 cows, 71 marts and 240 lambs since waste and the tribulations of the country had resulted in old grassums and the issues of court being irrecoverable.[95] The use of compositions to clear outstanding debts proved to be a popular expedient both for the debtor and the crown as a means of writing off bad debts and avoiding drawn out disputes over arrears. In 1501 William, lord Ruthven, a former chamberlain of Methven finally accounted for the arrears of his last account of 1484 and of the outstanding sum of £98-10s, £38-13-4 was allowed to the accountant for specified reasons and, in order to clear the remaining £69-16-8, Ruthven compounded with the king and the auditors for £30, paid to the comptroller.[96] Although the auditors were lenient towards accountants with genuine problems with irretrievable arreas and bad debts, nevertheless, those who attempted to hide the lining of their own pockets or their own inefficiency with such pleas were liable to have their goods poinded for the outstanding cash.

The auditors insisted that all accounts were fully cleared of outstanding sums. In 1502 Hugh Rose of Kilravock finally accounted for the arrears of his father who had last accounted as receiver of the lordships of Petty

---

94. ER, x, 327-8.

95. ER, x, 435.

96. ER, xi, 338.

and Brackley in 1469.[97] Such debts were rarely lost to the crown through the lapse of time. Many former local officials were summoned, 'vocandus', of account for their debts, if any. Concerning the rest of £71-11-1 from the joint account of sir Patrick Hume of Polwarth and William Cunningham of Craigans as chamberlains of Kilmarnock rendered in 1501, both were summoned but on 9 July 1504 the latter appeared before the auditors in response to the summons and successfully proved that he did not intromit with the farms concerned and was declared not responsible to the king for them.[98]

The failure on the part of many accountants to end their accounts only served to increase the difficulties faced by the auditors and also to submerge incidents of fraud in a mass of long accumulated arrears. The auditors were anxious that accountants not only make annual visits to the Exchequer but also 'red and end' their accounts when they did come. A proclamation in 1503 complained that most royal fiscal officials 'ar nocht comperit and ane uther part comperit and has past away, unendit their comptis, and contempnandly has dissobeyt'.[99] These accountants were ordered to complete their business under the pain of the loss of office and apprising of their goods. Despite such dire threats, it is doubtful if there was any sudden reformation on the part of royal officials.

In conclusion, although the accounts are set out in a fairly straightforward manner, in fact, they only presented a small, and in many ways, misleading, picture of the finances of the Scottish crown. In common with

---

97. ER, xii, 67. Allowances due to his father reduced the rest of £18-17s for which the son compounded with the auditors for £10, for which he granted a bond to the comptroller.

98. SRO, Craigans Writs, 62. ER, xi, 363, xiii, 107.

99. ADC, xiv, f 177.

state documents from other countries, these public finance records have provided the historian with only the bare bones of the fiscal situation, leaving untold many of the events and disputes which were enacted behind the official screen or at the grass roots. The extreme formality of the Exchequer Rolls and the unfortunate absence of private letters in the fifteenth century has meant that it is impossible, with only a few exceptions, to dig beneath the official documents. However, even from what outside information is available it is obvious that, in most cases, the figures recorded in these late Mediaevel accounts tended to reflect the sums for which the accountant was held responsible and not actual payments or receipts. In many ways, it could be said that the Scottish financial records, based on an extremely conservative system of accounting, have bequeathed to the present day historian a series of entries which contained as much truth as deception.

THE ACQUISITION AND THE EXPLOITATION OF ROYAL DEMESNE

A. INTRODUCTION ON ROYAL DEMESNE

In late Mediaeval Scotland, the king's landed estates formed only a part of the far wider concept 'of the Kingis patrimonie', a concept which also included the great customs, the burgh farms, gold and silver mines and all other items considered by the monarch to form part of 'his own'.[1] Parliamentary pleas that the king 'should live of his own' were evident in Mediaeval England but they remained absent from Scottish Parliamentary records. Concerning the English interpretation of the king's 'own', Stubbs, following the lead given by sir William Blackstone, asserted that Mediaeval kings were expected to live on their 'ordinary' revenue on their 'own', based principally on the revenue derived from the substational royal demesne, without recourse to taxation or 'extraordinary' revenue.[2] In opposition to the traditional Stubb's interpretation, Wolffe has introduced a completely new view, asserting that the'king's 'own' was anything and every thing which was legally his, contrasted with what was not 'his', but the property of his subjects'.[3] In other words, Parliamentary complaints that the king 'should live of his own' were directed not at the levying of taxation, for the fourteenth century was a period of heavy taxation in England, but at the detrimental effects of purveyance on the private property. Purveyance represented the requisitioning of provisions, goods, transport and even labour by royal officers for military expeditions and use of the royal household either for nominal payments or vague promises of recompense. In

---

1. Balfour's Practick's, i, 133-8.
2. For details, see Stubbs, Constitutional History.
3. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 49.

1376 a report on the Good Parliament recorded a plea that the king should be able to live and govern the kingdom and maintain the war 'on his own resources' without tampering with the property of his subjects.[4] Any assessment of the exact relationship between purveyance and the 'king's own' in Scotland was extremely difficult on account of the political timidity of Parliament in late Mediaeval Scotland.[5] In late Mediaeval Scotland, except for the censures delivered to David II and Robert III, Parliament remained the tool of the monarchy or whatever baronial faction held sway during the frequent minorities, and legislation which emanated from Parliament was frequently in the interest of the crown.[6] In the light of this situation, it is not surprising that the Parliamentary rolls contained no references concerning litigation or discussion of the 'king's own' or the use of purveyance. However, it seems possible that the conception of the 'king's own' as expressed by Wolffe in connection with the English crown was also prevalent in Scotland especially as Scottish kings were frequently in contact with the ideas prevalent in the southern kingdom.[7]

Undoubtedly the royal demesne formed part of the 'king's own', but what is open to more dubiety is the exact meaning of the word 'demesne'. In the 1870s Stubbs traced the history of the English crown estate or 'royal demesne' back to the Norman conquest of the eleventh century. His argument revolved round the assertion that the revenues of the English crown were divisible into two distinct portions, 'ordinary' revenue of which the income from the 'royal demesne' formed the basis and 'extraordinary' revenue,

---

4. The Anonimalle Chronicle, ed. Galbraith, 81. 'Od ses biens demesne et nyent raunsoner ses liges gentz de la terre'.

5. The 1326 grant of one tenth dealt with prises, that is the practice of purveyance.

6. For details, see Rait, The Parliaments of Scotland, 19-38.

7. Both David II and James I spent considerable time in captivity in England while the latter and James IV accepted English brides.

principally derived from the issues of taxation and that the Mediaeval monarch was expected to 'live of his own' from the profits extracted from the former class of revenue. His interpretation of the origins of baronial opposition to the English crown centred on the periodic and wanton dissipation of the 'royal demesne' by various monarchs, especially to foreign favourites. More recently Hoyt expounded his own theory of the nature of the 'royal demesne', crown estates which had not been subinfeudated and was retained by the king 'in his own hand', and that this 'royal demesne' was being deliberately built up during the period after the Conquest.[8] However, as revealed by Wolffe, Mediaeval conceptions of 'crown land', 'crown estate' or 'royal demesne' were at variance to those of more modern historians since such terms in the Middle Ages were employed to describe lands held directly of the crown by tenants-in-chief, a notion which included nearly all England.[9] Wolffe continued to assert that the existance of large tracts of 'crown land' in the modern idiom before the accession of Henry IV in 1399 is a myth. During the majority of the Middle Ages, the English Exchequer did not handle revenue from the royal landed property in the manner of the French 'chambre des comptes' or the Yorkish Chamber, and the English attitude to estates in the hands of the crown through inheritance, forfeiture for treason, or purchase was that they provided the crown with valuable source of royal patronage to relatives, the church, royal servants or anybody deemed worthy of reward.[10] However, with the gradual shrinkage of the Angevin Empire on the Continent in the thirteenth century, the accumulation of permanent holdings in England and Wales in the hands of the crown originated, a feature

---

8. Hoyt, The Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History, 2-6.

9. Wolffe, The Crown Lands, 17-19. Dialogus de Scaccario, ed. and and trans. Johnson, 96.

10. For an expansion of this theme, see Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History.

which was greatly accelerated after the property windfall of 1399 following the Lancastrian accession. Concerning financial arrangements in the fifteenth century, Wolffe asserted that there was a 'growing climate of informed public opinion which demanded, in parliament, for the first time in English history, the development of a substantial crown landed estate to make a permanent, reliable contribution towards government solvency'.[11]

In Scotland the early history of the 'royal demesne' or 'crown estates' is far less clear since there is nothing comparable with the Doomsday Book and other surviving documents are extremely scarce. In the years before the reign of Alexander III there is little indication of extent or nature of crown holdings of any description. During the reign of Alexander III and for most of the fourteenth century, the sheriff was largely responsible for the collection of rents, both in cash and in kind, from lands 'in the king's hand', as well as a variety of other receipts. In addition, other 'receivers' were also engaged on similar assignments: between 1263 and 1266 there were two accounts of the baillies of Inverkoich and Tynedale, while Reginald Cheyne was appointed farmer of Formartin, Emeric Maxwell, farmer of Glendochart and in 1289 Duncan, earl of Fife accounted as farmer of the Manor of Dull.[12] However, many of the lands retained permanently by the crown prior to the wars of independance were located close to the site of royal castles and the grain and money rents derived from these estates tended to contribute to the maintenance of these castles.[13]

In 1264 the account of the chamberlain, William, earl of Mar revealed that, of the £5,413-13s with which he was charged, £2,896-18-3, slightly over

---

11. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 51.

12. ER, i, 3, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 48.

13. ER, i, 39.

half the total, was described as having been received from the 'farms of the baillies from both sides of the Scottish sea'.[14] The sheriffs' rolls for the period from 1263 to 1266 are so full of abbreviations and omissions that it would be difficult to extract any conclusive information but those for the years 1288 to 1290 are of greater value.[15] Among the entries recorded in the sheriffs' charge were receipts, in both grain and cash, from the 'small farms of the baillie'. For instance William Sinclair, sheriff of Edinburgh, was charged with the receipt of 70 chalders of wheat, unknown quantities of oatmeal, malt, fodder and hens and also £81-1-8 for the small farms for the year ending 12 March 1288-9. In addition, the sheriff was also responsible for the annual farm from the lands of Ratho and Bathgate at £167-11-9.[16] From the evidence displayed by Sinclair's account and those of other sheriffs' rolls for that period, it would seem that rents payable to the crown were mostly paid in kind with only a few being submitted in specie. The exact composition of the 'small farms' is not revealed in rolls but the amount seems to have remainded fairly constant and probably represented a series of relatively small renderings of crown farms, various annual rents and thanage 'reddendos'.[17] Although, on the surface, it would appear that the profit from crown estates made a significant

---

14. ER, i, 10. This figure of £2,896 must have represented the net income derived from the 'baillie's farms', the gross receipt presumably amounted to even greater value.

15. ER, i, 1-34, 35-51.

16. ER, i, 41-3.

17. The account of Duncan, earl of Fife as sheriff of Dumbarton for a two year period recorded two returns from the 'small farms', each valued at exactly £26-13-4 annually. The totals derived from this source rarely seem to have exceeded £100 yearly, although in 1288-9 the sheriff of Lanark was charged with £399-6-6. ER, i, 38, 39.

contribution to royal income, this would be to make the same assumption as Hoyt. Despite the fact that these lands and annual rents were 'in the king's hands', there is no indication as to the nature of the king's occupation or indeed whether the crown regarded these estates as a source of revenue or the vehicle for royal patronage.[18] The only hint of the permanent royal occupation and exploitation of an estate occurred in the case of the lands of Dull. In 1263 the sheriff of Perth was charged with the annual farm from the lands of Dull at £69-0-5 while in 1289 Duncan, earl of Fife rendered a two year account as farmer of the manor of Dull in which he submitted a gross farm of £503-13-4, calculated through the extent in operation after the death of Alexander III.[19]

However the evidence for the fourteenth century is far more conclusive. As in England it seems fairly certain that landed estates in the possession of the crown were not to be retained so much for their financial contribution but employed instead for their formidable contribution to the wider sphere of royal patronage. Apart from the need to provide for members of the royal family, successive monarchs in the fourteenth century seem to have employed landed estates as a vehicle for rewarding loyal adherents and other favoured persons. Although this trend continued throughout the century two events caused a rapid acceleration of this process, firstly, after the wars of Independance, Robert I granted large portions of property to his supporters in recompense for their services during the war with England and secondly, during the period from the accession of Robert II until the

---

18. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 46. In England it was equally unrealistic to equate the receipts from the shire with the 'royal demesne' since the sheriffs' receipts included not only the issues from the sheriffs' farms but also a host of other payments, temporary escheats, burgh farms, etc.

19. ER, i, 3, 48. The lands of Dull formerly belonged to the Celtic monastery of Dunkeld but fell to the crown when the abbacy was secularised in the eleventh or twelfth century.

return of James I from England, the relative weakness of the crown resulted in the heavy exploitation of royal patronage by the baronial class. The estates acquired by Robert I after the wars of independance were not retained in royal possession in order to make a significant contribution to the running costs of government but were, in the majority of cases, quickly regranted to fulfil the requirements of crown patronage. For instance, the lands of Ratho and Bathgate, the farm of which was received by the sheriff of Edinburgh in 1288-9, were gifted by Robert I to Walter Stewart at the time of his marriage to Marjory Bruce.[20] However, after the release of David II from captivity in England in November 1357, the crown's attitude to the 'royal demesne' altered temporarily. The high ransom demanded by Edward III for David's release forced the latter to view the 'royal demesne' as a source of much needed revenue rather than a basis for royal patronage. In order to achieve this alteration David II issued stringent provision for the resumption of all alientated lands and rents. The effect of this rather drastic measure was to congregate a substantial collection of estates whose yearly farm was devoted to the profit of the crown. In the two statues David II ordained the resumption of all property and revenues which had belonged to the crown 'of auld', 'ab antiquo', that is in the reign of Alexander III, which were to remain in the hands of the crown 'for the expenses of the king'.[21] For instance, within the shire of Inverness, the lands of the earldom of Moray were resumed from the earl of March, the lands of Badenoch from the Steward, and the lands of Lewis, Lochaber, Garmornore and part of Kintyre from John of the Isles.[22] The

---

20. ER, i, 41. RMS, i, App. 2, Index A, 219. These lands had been held by the sister of William Lyon and were bought back for the crown by Alexander III.

21. APS, i, 134, 168-171. This entry contained a detailed list of lands and annual rents whose previous alienation had been revoked by this promulgation.

22. APS, i, 168.

1359 accounts of the sheriffs recorded the actual fiscal exploitation of many of the resumed lands. These accounts, more detailed than those of the late thirteenth century, established that, by the mid fourteenth century, rents were being increasingly submitted in cash, although the farm of the lands of Bothkennar in Stirlingshire amounted to 20 chalders of wheat and 12 chalders of meal.[23] Also these sheriffs' accounts tended to divide the receipts into two main sections, the 'redditus assise', regular cash payments from lands held of the crown by the service of ward and relief, and secondly, 'terre firmate', the farm of estates in the actual possession of the crown. Although the resumed lands formed the basis of the latter section, the farm of property temporarily in the hands of the crown through wardship or non-entry was also included.[24] John Menteith, sheriff of Clackmannan, was charged with the farm of lands for the three terms before 24 March 1359 but not for previous terms since the crown had gifted them to private individuals; the lands of Gilbrathton had been in the possession of Robert Erskine, Alloway had been held by sir William Baillie, while the lands of Gatesend and the mill of Clackmannan had been conceded to Robert Bruce.[25] However the desire to amass a large block of permanent royal land holdings did not outlive the emergency of David II's ransom and under Robert II, Robert III and the regency of the dukes of Albany, the heavy demands of patronage quickly dissipated the stock of estates still in the possession of the crown. For example, in 1358 the sheriff of Perth was charged with the annual farm, £22-13-4, of the lands of Rait, formerly in the hands of William Semple, but ten years later the lands had been granted to Robert Bruce in fee and

---

23. ER, i, 576.

24. ER, i, 572, 589.

25. ER, i, 571-3. RMS, i, App. 2, Index A. No. 1011.

MISSING

PRINT

heritage.[26] Similarly the lands of Alloway in Clackmannan were the property of Thomas Erskine by the reign of Robert III.[27] Despite the terms of the revocation statute and regarding the desperate necessity for ready cash to meet the demands of the ransom, the claims on royal favour were still in evidence. In 1359 the sheriff of Stirling collected no rents from the lands of Quyltinhoue and Raploch as they continued in the possession of the countesses of Wigtown and Strathearn respectively 'by royal permission'.[28]

From the mid fourteenth century until 1424 the traditional attitude to land as a source of crown patronage was again in operation. With one hand the crown accepted estates which had, for one reason or another, fellen into its hands and, with the other hand, they were being regranted to other individuals, thus ensuring a constant turnover of landed possession. Benefactors from royal patronage varied considerably. The main group for which the king was expected to provide was his own family. Apart from customs and burgh farms, Margaret Logy, queen to David II,was endowed with the rent from the lands of the constabulary of Kinghorn, £89 annual farm, the lands of the thanage of Kinclaven, Abernyt, Fardell, Rait, Lethendy, Glasclone, Balcarne, Cockreske, the Abthania of Dull, which was subsequently transferred to her son, John Logy, Stobhall, Cargill and Kinloch, bestowed on her nephew, Malcolm Drummond, within the shire of Perth.[29] In the same way, queen Margaret employed the property included in her jointure to meet the demands and claims of her right of patronage. In 1368 Thomas Wauchop, baillie of the queen's lands within the shire of Perth, was not charged with the farm

---

26. ER, i, 554. RMS, i, 288.

27. RMS, i, App. 2, Index A, 1863.

28. ER, i, 576.

29. ER, ii, 296-8. Margaret Drummond was the widow of sir John Logy of that ilk. The lands of Lethendy had belonged to sir Thomas Bisset but had been sold by his son to the crown. Sir Thomas or his son must have run into considerable financial embarrassment since the lands of Glascone and Balcarne, also Bisset property, were in mortgage to the queen. The evidence was based on the survival of two accounts, dated 1368, that of Adam Spens, queen's baillie of Kinghorn, and that of Thomas Wauchop,baillie of the queen's lands in Perthshire. There is

of the lands of Ardef since they were in the possession of Walter Moigne through concession of the queen.[30] Natural sons were also supplied with landed estates. On 15 January 1382-3 John Stewart, an illegitimate son of Robert II and Mary Cardny, was in receipt of a gift of the lands of Kinclaven and others within the thanage.[31] The numerous offsprings associated with Robert II and III consumed a substantial portion of land available for distribution. As noble lines died out the estates and titles were immediately dispersed to the numerous royal children.[32] For instance, the earldoms of Fife, Menteith, Athole, Buchan, Caithness and Strathearn were all redistributed to the various legitimate progeny of Robert II. Great and small landowners, royal servants, favourites and the church also looked towards the crown as a perpetual source of endowment. It was during the fourteenth century that many of the great landowners of Scotland utilised the relative weakness of the crown in order to amass large estates through purchase, inheritance, marriage and also through the liberality of royal patronage. It was mostly during this period of royal laxity and generosity that the Douglas inheritance was constructed; the lands of the forest of Jedburgh and Ettrick, Eskdale and Lauderdale were received through the grateful munificence of Robert I,[33] the lands of Galloway 'betwixt the Nith and the Cree' were conceded by David II in 1369,[34] the earldom of Wigtown through purchase from Thomas Flemming in 1372,[35] and the earldom of

---

30. ER, ii, 297.

31. RMS, i, 729.

32. There is a list of the legitmate children of Robert II and III in Paul, The Scots Peerage, i, 15-18.

33. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 9, 10, 354-6. Robertson, Index, 10, Nos. 21, 24.

34. RMS, i, 329.

35. RMS, i, 507.

Mar and lordship of Bothwell through marriage.[36] Many fourteenth century nobles like the earls of Douglas established tailzies which the crown was compelled to confirm and which had the effect of cutting out heiresses, whom the crown could marry off, thus limiting the scope of royal patronage.

During the period from the termination of the wars of independence until the release of James I from captivity in England in 1424, except for the short period following David II's revocation, landed estates which fell to the crown were fairly rapidly redistributed according to the dictates of royal patronage. While other landowners were busy accumulating substantial and permanent landed estate, property acquired by the crown tended to be retained only for a short interval. Although the nobility were also required to disburse property in the interests of patronage most of them were unwilling to cut their potential revenue by permitting the wholesale alienation of their estates as the crown had done. Although this represented the general attitude of fourteenth century monarchs towards the landed resources available to the crown, certain holdings do seem to have remained in royal hands for lengthy periods. There exist certain difficulties in tracing such lands, not only because of the shortage of evidence, but also because the farms of individual estates in royal possession seem to have been collected by different fiscal officials. The lands of the Abthania of Dull provided an excellent example of both the diversifications in the manner of accounting and also the effect on royal property of the demands of patronage. In 1263 the farm of Dull was collected by the sheriff of Perth but over twenty years later Duncan, earl of Fife assumed the role of farmer of the manor of Dull.[37] The next reference to the estate occurred

---

36. Fraser, The Douglas Book, i, 371. RMS, i, App. 2, Index A, 1862.

37. ER, i, 3, 48.

in 1360 when the chamberlain appears to have been directly responsible for the net farm of Dull, presumably received from a baillie or some other local receiver.[38] Despite the fact that part of the farm was reserved to the Steward for the repayment of a royal debt, this situation seems to have continued until 1368 when the lands of Dull were granted to John Logy through a gift of queen Margaret, the wife of David II,[39] who retained the estate as part of her jointure. The fate of the lands disappeared from record subsequent to that grant until 1397 when an annual pension of £136 was gifted annually to Robert, earl of Fife in exchange for his right to the lands of the Abthania of Dull, the farm of which had been paid to the earl until Whitsun 1397.[40] Although the fate of the lands of Dull is reasonably well documented compared with other estates, much will remain unknown but there is, however, sufficient evidence to trace the destiny of these lands. As with many other portions of property the Dull estates met the demands of royal patronage and when not required, helped to swell the royal coffers. As in the reign of Alexander III, lands assigned for the maintenance of royal castles tended to remain unaffected by royal liberality. For instance, the lands of Bothkennar, attached to the upkeep of Stirling castle were not gifted to anyone not associated with the stronghold.[41]

From the death of David II, only a few isolated sheriffs' accounts have survived for the years 1388 and 1391-2, and those that have have recorded a substantial fall in the 'terre firmate' collected by these officials.[42] Although the accounts of royal baillies are now lacking for the later

---

38. ER, ii, 48.

39. ER, ii, 73, III, 298, 352. The baillie of Dull was named as John of Lorne in the chamberlain's account of 1370.

40. ER, iii, 427.

41. ER, i, 179-180, 297-8, 387, 404-5, 576. RMS, i, 318, 554.

42. ER, iii, 161-7, 264-272.

fourteenth century, some undoubtedly did exist. However, the overall impression remains that, by the first two decades of the fifteenth century, the property permanently exploited by royal officials was extremely small in extent, principally through the claims on royal patronage. Until 1424 the Scottish crown did not possess a 'royal demesne' in the Stubbsian context and Hoyt's impression of a 'royal demesne' was as misleading in Scotland as it was in England. Fourteenth century sheriffs in Scotland tended to account for all land 'in the king's hand' for which they were responsible and little distinction was made between annual rents, thanages, lands temporarily held by the crown in ward or non-entry, and land which the crown retained on a more permanent footing. It was this latter type of holding which formed 'the king's property' of the fifteenth century, but in the previous centuries, its contribution to the cost of government seems to have been incidental, holding second place to the demands of royal patronage.

B. THE ACQUISITION OF A PERMANENT ROYAL DEMESNE UNDER JAMES I

In both Scotland and England in the fifteenth century there arose a completely new and radical approach to the question of the contribution of lands which had, by accident or design, fallen into the king's hands. From the fourteenth century the English crown was in permanent occupation of certain estates but it was only after the association of the vast Lancastrian inheritance with the crown in 1399 that opinion in Parliament began to seriously demand the exploitation of a substantial royal landed estate in order to make a permanent and effective contribution towards the cost of government. In other words, there was a demand that royal property should make a sufficient contribution in order to ensure that the government would

be financially self sufficient, that is to be able 'to live of its own'.[43] A further fillip was given to this development between 1461 and 1509 when further holdings were accepted into royal hands. Under Edward IV a complete reorganisation of the fiscal machinery was undertaken. The essence of the reforms in royal financial arrangements was a dramatic reduction in the power and scope of the Mediaeval Exchequer; the Exchequer of Receipt, although continuing to operate, ceased to operate as the principal fiscal office, while the Exchequer of Account lost its powers to hold full audits of royal officers administrating crown property and retained only the ability to preserve these accounts for future reference. The Mediaeval Exchequer was unable to provide the crown with prompt payments of ready cash at fairly short notice and the system of assignments by Exchequer tallies had become an extremely sluggish and fossilized method of payment. Instead a large proportion of royal income was paid into the king's Chamber without any interference from the Exchequer. The Chamber became the controlling organ of the Yorkist financial organisation from which, by means of 'warrants under his signet, his seal of the earldom of March or by indentures drawn up between the payer and one of the king's officers on his verbal orders' the king removed sums of money whenever they became available.[44] Since the revenues from royal landed estates now made such a substantial contribution to the king's income, it was essential that the profit from this source was efficiently collected. For this purpose, professional receivers were appointed by the crown to procure the revenues accruing from crown property and transport the cash to a pre-arranged centre. These Yorkist receivers were no mere rent collectors for, in a memorandum of 1484, their duties were described as 'to ride, survey, receive and remember on every behalf that

---

43. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 51.

44. Ibid, 169.

might be most for the king's profit and thereof yearly to make report'.[45] They were required to make a complete circuit of the lands under their jurisdiction and their contribution formed the basis of the new Yorkist fiscal scheme. In addition to professional receivers, special auditors were engaged to draw up valors and advise on estate management. Edward IV introduced the scheme of large scale estate management, as employed by his father on the lands forming the duchy of York in the early fifteenth century,[46] into the administration of the royal demesne. Thus, Edward IV inaugurated an efficient network of receivers of land revenues who were directly responsible to the crown and whose accounts were rendered directly to the Chamber, ignoring any claims made from the Exchequer. These revenues were fed straight into the royal coffers and were immune from the dispersal by Exchequer assignment.[47] The revolution in royal financial administration, as undertaken by the energetic and forceful Edward IV, brought a new dimension to the contribution of royal property to the total income of the crown. It is difficult to assess the precise contribution of crown estates to the total income of the Chamber since the latter's accounts were held in private, but from valuations attached to the principal estate complexes known to have been in the hands of Richard III, it would appear that between £22,000 and £25,000 was extracted from this source. However, by 1502-5 the average annual income from crown lands appear to have amounted to £40,000 out of a total receipt of £105,000 by the Chamber.[48] Thus, it is obvious that,

---

45. Wolffe, The Crown Lands, doc. No. 14 (32).

46. For details of the nature of the estate administration of the lands of the Duchy of York under duke Richard, see Rosenthal 'The Estates and Finances of Richard, duke of York, 1411-60', Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance History.

47. Greater detail concerning the alterations in the royal fiscal machinery under Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII, is given in, Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, and The Crown Lands, 1461-1536.

48. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 188, 204.

during the second half of the fifteenth century and the first decade of the sixteenth, the revenue derived from royal property made a significant impact on the total income of the Chamber although the latter also relied heavily on other sources of income.

In Scotland, a significant alteration in the attitude of the crown towards the purpose of landed estates occurred with the return of James I from England in 1424. During his sojourn in England, James witnessed the existance and the fiscal benefits of the massive royal holding of Henry IV and V. In was probably the contrast with the landed poverty of the Scottish crown which impelled James to rectify the situation and place the Scottish crown on a footing parallel to that in England. James I was desperate to ressurect the financial position of the crown from the nadir which it had attained under the first two Stewarts. As well as curbing the financial powers of the chamberlain, revoking a host of pensions and annuities attached to the great customs and burgh farms and introducing customs levies on hitherto unaffected commodities, James I made an initial and determined attempt to build up a permanent stock of royal landed property from which the crown could derive a constant flow of revenue. It would not be true to suggest that James I utterly abandoned the concept of employing landed estates as a source of royal patronage - this indeed would have been an extremely foolish course - but the prime consideration regarding lands which had been transferred to the crown was, in future, to centre round their contribution towards the expenses of the royal household and other government costs. Most of the leading magnates in Scotland had, during the course of the fourteenth century, amassed large landed estates but in this development the crown had missed out and James I was determined to retrieve the situation. He was determined to create a permanent territorial foundation for the crown in Scotland, at the expense of many of the leading noble houses. James was equally anxious that the Scottish monarchy was to retain

a sound financial basis in order that items vital for the independence and prestige of the crown could be acquired. In order to ressurect the power and prestige of the crown it was vital that the king retained a constant and substantial supply of revenue. To elevate the prestige of the Scottish crown above that of the highest noble families the former sustained the cost of a large and well endowed royal household and also of building expensive public works. In addition, the maintainance of the political independence of the monarchy considerable funds were expended on the purchase and employment of artillery - too expensive even for the most powerful magnate - and the ability to sustain the cost of campaigns against recalcitrant nobles, proved to be extremely costly ventures. For a strong monarchy it was essential that a substantial and reasonably constant supply of revenue was available, of which the income from royal property was to form a large proportion.

Donaldson has characterised James I as 'an angry man in a hurry'[49] and in many ways this is an extremely telling description since James was the first to realise that any attempt to reassert the power and authority of the crown required quick and decisive action. In his first Parliament of 26 May 1424, a statute was issued concerning the lands and rents 'quhilkis war of befor tyme our soverane lorde the kingis antecessouris ... all and sindrie schirefis of his Realme to gar inquyre be the best eldest and worthiest of thar bailzereis quhat landis, possessionis or annuell rentis pertenys to the king or has pertenyt in his antecessour is tymes of gude memor Dauid Robert and Robert his progenitouris and in quhais handis thai nowe be and at ilk schiref gar retour the inquest vnder his seil and thair seilis that beis apone it' and the king retained the option to summon all

---

49. Donaldson, Scottish Kings, 63.

his tenants to 'schawe thar charteris and euidentis and swa be thar haldingis he may persaue quhat pertenys to thame'.[50] The actual effect of this legislation is extremely difficult to determine, especially since royal confirmations of previous concessions were normal at the outset of a new reign, either as a revenue raising device or as a way of extending patronage.

What is more definite were the steps undertaken by James to pursue the dual policy of reducing the political and territorial power of the higher nobility and, at the same time, strengthening the landed wealth of the crown. On his return from England in 1424 James I must have viewed with considerable disfavour the power and influence of his leading magnates, especially by his own house of Stewart, and the contrasting landed poverty of the crown. Because of the demands of patronage during the course of the fourteenth century, estates in the hands of the crown in 1424 amounted to little beyond the traditional Stewart property of Cunningham,[51] Kyle Regis,[52] East Kilbride,[53] Cowal, Bute, Arran, the two Cumbries,[54] bound to the upkeep of Dumbarton castle and other estates in the south west corner of Scotland as well as the earldom of Carrick, bestowed on John Stewart, the eldest son of Robert Stewart, afterwards Robert II, by David II on 22 June 1368.[55] However although in theory this inheritance represented a fairly considerable collection of estates, unfortunately a substantial proportion of the property within

---

50. APS, ii, 4.

51. Robertson's Index, 9.

52. ER, vi, xcv.

53. Robertson's Index, 9.

54. APS, i, 142. In 1366 the lands of Bute, Cowal, Arron, Knapdale and two Cumbries, belonging to the Steward, were assessed at £1,000 by the old tax code.

55. APS, i, 171. RMS, i, 462. The earldom of Carrick was associated with the crown at the accession of Robert I who had held the title and estates of Carrick prior to his elevation.

these lordships had been alienated by earlier landlords for the purpose of patronage and military service. For instance, property from which the crown was able to extract a regular rent in Cunningham and Kilbride had, by the first half of the fifteenth century, dwindled to nothing.[56] On the other hand, the crown still continued to draw a regular income from Bute, Arran, Cowal and Carrick. In 1440 the annual farm of the lands of Bute yielded a gross income to the crown of £141-16s, over 11 chalders of barley and 40 marts, the lands of Arran £56-18-8, 3 chalders of barley and 17 marts, while in Cowal by 1445 only the lands of Glendaruel, at an annual farm of £13-6-8 and 44 marts, and Dunoon at £14-13-4, still remained crown property.[57] Within the earldom of Carrick, in 1434 the annual farm of various lands including the baronies of Dalrymple and Carrick, the lands of Dundonald, Mauchlin, Stewarton and Bardbeth, amounted to £411-2-11.[58] However, by 1448 the baillie of Carrick was only responsible for the collection of the rents of Girvanhead and Turnberry at £28-13-4 annually although in 1450 the lands of Dundonald at £16-6-8 were included in the account.[59] The substantial alienation of property within the earldom of Carrick requires explanation. A substantial portion of the earldom was granted to the Kennedy family in the fourteenth century and many of the lands recorded in the 1434 account were in fact the property of the Kennedys and the farms were collected by the royal baillie through the enactment of feudal incidents.[60]

It is, in fact, extremely difficult to assess the amount of landed property which belonged to the crown at the accession of James I. As in

---

56. ER, iv, 594, v, 292, 414.

57. ER, v, 79-83, 201. The rents from the lands of the two Cumbries were charged to the sheriff of Dumbarton at £33-6-8, 3 chalders, 2 bolls of barley and 10 marts annually. ER, vi, 85.

58. ER, iv, 595. This entry contained a list of the lands in question.

59. ER, v, 328, 522.

60. RMS, ii, 403, 413.

previous centuries, the crown tended to retain property in the vicinity of royal castles, especially Edinburgh, Stirling and Linlithgow, in order to finance their upkeep. In 1329 the lands of Skeoch, Craigforth and Raploch among other estates situated in fairly close proximity to the castle at Stirling were styled 'terre firmate' or crown property and in 1454 these lands were still regarded as royal possessions.[61] During the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries many of these 'castle lands' had been alienated in the interests of patronage. However, concerning any other estates which James I might have inherited in 1424, there is little knowledge since no detailed accounts have survived for the period.

As with the fourteenth century sheriffs, many of the earlier Ballivi ad Extra accounts tended not to distinguish between temporary and permanent royal land holdings, they were all regarded as land held 'in the hands of the king'. However, it is vital that these two types of holdings are separated and, as the fifteenth century progressed, there appears to have been an effort to divorce the two classes of holding. By the middle of the century both Ballivi ad Extra and sheriffs frequently provided separate sections in their accounts for royal property and land held as feudal casualties.[62] But, more conclusively, a different terminology was employed to distinguish between temporary possession by the crown, usually the result of the levying of feudal incidents which tended to be designated as land 'in the hands of the king'[63], and estates which provided the crown with a constant source of revenue which were usually termed either 'lands of the lord king'[64] or 'the king's property'.[65] From the latter, the crown, through a local receiver,

---

61. ER, i, 178, vi, 64.

62. ER, v, 653, 668, vi, 154.

63. ER, v, 570.

64. ER, v, 522.

65. ER, vi, 668, vi, 154.

was entitled either to extract all available profit from these lands, including the annual farm or rent, grassums and entries, or else to occupy the estates with 'the king's own goods', usually grain, sheep or cattle. The former represented holdings which had been earlier subinfeudated by the crown and had temporarily returned to the superior, the king, for the duration of a minority or non-entry. It is to the 'king's own property' that the modern usage 'royal demesne' must apply.

Faced with such a modest foundation, James I was anxious to the point of desperation, to enlarge his territorial property, even at the expense of legality. It is easy to be critical of James's dubious methods of acquiring substantial estates from the highest nobility, but, at the same time, consideration must be given to the problem facing James on his return to Scotland.

To this challenge James reacted with extraordinary vigour. The first step was taken less than a year after his return from England when he secured the forfeiture and execution of Murdoch, duke of Albany and most of his kinsmen. The exact nature of the charges against Albany are not known but the fact that the Albanys represented the pinnacle of baronial power and that, through the office of chamberlain, they had retained a tight hold over royal finances, were undoubtedly the principal factors surrounding the sudden and comprehensive nature of their fall. Not only was duke Murdoch executed but his landed estates, annual rents, customs concessions and all other titles and profits were declared to be forfeit to the crown. From this windfall the crown derived great material advancement, for, apart from the resumption of fees and pensions totalling £1,469 annually,[66] the substantial territorial possessions of duke Murdoch were confiscated to the crown. These estates included the earldom of Fife,

---

66. ER, iv, 377.

obtained by Robert, the third son of Robert II, through an indenture with Isabell, countess of Fife on 30 March 1371 whereby the latter accepted Robert as her heir to the estates and title of Fife, reserving for herself a liferent of the property,[67] the property of the baronies of Strathurd, Strathbran, Discher, Toyer with the island of Loch Tay, the barony of Oneil in Aberdeenshire and other estates, resigned in 1389 by countess Isabell to Robert II who subsequently conveyed them to Robert, earl of Fife,[68] the lands of Fortingall, gifted to earl Robert by Robert III,[69] the earldom of Menteith, acquired by Robert through marriage with Margaret, countess of Menteith in 1361[70], and the annual rent of 20 marks from the lands of Craigforth in Stirlingshire.[71] Through the medium of royal patronage and by means of two extremely advantageous agreements with the female heiresses of the earldoms of Menteith and Fife, earl Robert succeeded in amassing substantial territorial holdings in Central Scotland, making him probably the wealthiest and most powerful baron in late fourteenth century Scotland. The gross landed wealth of the Albany inheritance taken over as crown property in 1425 amounted to over £1,200 in cash with large quantities of

---

67. Fraser, The Red Book of Menteith, ii, 251-4. The indenture stated that Lady Isabell acknowledged earl Robert as her heir to the earldom of Fife on the condition that the latter was to use his power and influence to recover the earldom for the countess who had resigned it through force and fear. Also a third of the revenues from the earldom were reserved for Mary, countess of Fife, the mother of Isabell and on her death, the third was to be transferred to Robert.

68. The Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, ii, 30. This reference contained the charter concerning the lands of Coull and Oneil. For the other lands involved in the concession, see SRO, Charter No. 196.

69. RMS, i, App 2, Index A, 1744.

70. Fraser, The Red Book of Menteith, i, 127. Theiner's Vetera Monumenta, 315.

71. ER, iii, 680. The annual rent was originally valued at £26-13-4 but in 1407 half of the proceeds were granted to a chaplain praying in the chapel of St. Michael in Stirling castle. RMS, i, 895.

grain and livestock.[72] The removal of the house of Albany not only displayed one of the principal threats to the resurgance of the crown but also made a substantial contribution to its future financial stability.

In addition, three other private inheritances became crown property during the reign of James I. On the death of David, earl of Strathearn in the 1380s, his widow, Euphemia Lindsay, married sir Patrick Graham and her son Malise succeeded to the Strathearn estates in the early fifteenth century.[73] James took advantage of the earl's minority and deprived him of his inheritance on the pretext that the earldom passed only to male heirs and that his mother was not entitled to transmit either the title or the estates. The fact that Malise was the senior male representative of the royal line descended from the marriage of Robert II and Euphemia Ross could not have helped his cause. James completed the arrangement with customary efficiency, Malise was employed as one of the hostages for the king's ransom, a role which he was to play for the next twenty six years,[74] he was compensated for his loss with part of the old earldom of Menteith,[75] and the earldom of Strathearn was granted in liferent to Walter, earl of Atholl[76] on 22nd July 1427.

James I's claim to the earldom of March was based on events which occurred prior to his accession. In 1395 Elizabeth, daughter of George,

---

72. ER, v, 461-2, 466-71, 474-7, 480, 482-3. These figures were calculated from the first recorded accounts of these estates in the Exchequer Rolls. The kind rents included 35 chalders of what, 89 chalders of oats, 24 chalders of meal, 63 chalders of barley, 16 stukmarts, 34 sheep, 140 salmon, 471 capons, 104 geese and 60 poultry.

73. Sir Patrick Graham was killed on 10 August 1413.

74. Rotuli Scotiae, ii, 368.

75. Fraser, The Red Book of Menteith, ii, 293. The charter was dated 6 September 1427 and gave details of the lands involved in the concession.

76. RMS, ii, 93.

earl of March was betrothed to David, duke of Rothesay, the eldest son of Robert III, but about 1400 the arrangement was repudiated and the duke married a daughter of the earl of Douglas instead. March found solace on the other side of the border and on account of his military support to the English crown, his lands and title were confiscated to the crown by Robert III.[77] Although the earldom had been subsequently granted to David, duke of Rothesay,[78] it would appear that the earl of Douglas had taken active possession of the lands of the earldom and also those of Annandale.[79] Despite the fact that Albany had reversed the decision of forfeiture on March in 1409, in 1434-5 earl George was again deprived of his inheritance by James I on the grounds that Albany was not in a position to effect the original restoration.[80] George, 'the late earl' seems to have meekly accepted this fate and was in receipt of certain payments from the crown during the reign of James II and there is no evidence to suggest that George was compensated with a grant of the earldom of Buchan.[81]

Finally, in 1435, on the death without living heirs, of Alexander Stewart, earl of Mar, James I, ignoring the Erskine claim, assumed possession

---

77. ER, vi, 55. RMS, i, App 2, Index A, 1906, 1946.

78. ER, vi, 55.

79. Swintons of that ilk, xiv-xix.

80. APS, ii, 23. The forfeiture only included the lands of the earldom of March and the lordship of Dunbar since the lands of Annandale had been conceded to the earl of Douglas on 24 October 1409 as part of the arrangement for the rehabilitation of George, earl of March. RMS, i, 920.

81. ER, v, 383, 435, 497, 644, 685. Both Balfour-Melville and Donaldson mention the gift of the earldom of Buchan to March, the latter stating 'that it was poorer property and one which separated him territorially from the English friends with whom his family had been in treasonable association'. This idea was copied from Bower, who, in any case, was misinformed concerning the date of March's forfeiture, giving 7 August 1434 instead of 10 January 1434-5. Donaldson, Scottish Kings, 72. APS, ii, 23. Balfour-Melville, James I, King of Scots, 216. Liber Pluscardine, xi, 6. There is no reason to suppose that Elizabeth, countess of Buchan, did not continue to hold the earldom in liferent. ER, v, 55, 516.

of the earldom. From Whitsun 1436 Adam Falconer, chamberlain of Mar, accounted to the crown for the profits from the lands of Strathdon, Strathdee, Cromar, Finlarg, and Mugwell, contributing a gross annual rent of £397.[82] In 1404 Alexander Stewart, the illegitimate son of 'the Wold of Badenoch' compelled the heiress, Isabell, countess of Mar, to become his wife and extorted from her a liferent title to her inheritance. This took the form of two charters, the first issued on 12 August 1404 whereby Alexander Stewart received a charter from countess Isabell of the lands of earldom of Mar and Garioch, the castle of Kildrummy, the forest of Jedburgh and other estates which, failing any issue from the marriage, were to be settled on his heirs alone.[83] However this arrangement, which represented a complete flaunting of the usual laws of succession, was even too extreme for the pliant Robert III who refused any confirmation of the charter. A second settlement was issued on 9 December which repeated many of the terms of the previous charter although the remainder had been altered from the heirs of Alexander Stewart to those of Isabell.[84] Although a memorandum of 9 September recorded that countess Isabell, 'holding the keys of the castle in her hands, deliberately chose the said sir Alexander Stewart for her husband, and gave to him, in free marriage, the castle Kildrummy ...', there can be little doubt that Alexander's acquisition was the result of force and that Robert III, when he confirmed the December charter on 21 January 1404-5, he was merely giving a rubber stamp to a 'fait accomplis'.[85]

---

82. ER, v, 54.

83. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 167.

84. Ibid, iv, 169.

85. Ibid, iv, 269. RMS, i, App 2, Index A, 1908. Crawford, Earldom of Mar, 206-7. For the full memorandum aconcerning the submission of countess Isabell, see The Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 167.

In an indenture of 16 November 1420 between earl Alexander and Murdoch, duke of Albany, the latter, in order to secure the political support of Mar, promised to confirm Alexander's hereditary grant of the earldom to his illegitimate son, sir Thomas Stewart and also that the duke would not entertain any project of marriage between his heir, Walter Stewart, and the daughter of sir Robert Erskine, a claimant to part of the estates of Mar.[86] This arbitrary rejection of the Erskine claim to half the earldom based on the marriage of sir Thomas Erskine and Janet Keith in 1370, was repeated by James I on 28 May 1426 when the arrangements for the succession, as mentioned in the 1420 charter, were confirmed with the remainder falling to the crown.[87] Under the terms of this final charter, in 1435, on the death of earl Alexander - his son Thomas having predeceased him - the earldom was deemed to have fallen to the crown under the conditions of the remainder.

James I has been accused of 'mere acquisitiveness' but that can only be one side of the story. That James flaunted the accepted laws of inheritance cannot be denied, especially in the case of March and Mar, but the situation demanded rigorous measures if the crown was to succeed in rejuvenating its image and compiling sufficient landed property to ensure that it rose above even the highest of the nobility both in material wealth and in prestige.

Although in 1425 Duncan, earl of Lennox was executed along with the Albanys, his estates and title do not appear to have been forfeited to the crown, although, in effect, the latter seems to have extracted the profits from the lands for a considerable period. Despite the fact that the

---

86. The Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 181-2.

87. Ibid, iv, 183.

legitimate heir to the Lennox estates, countess Isabell, lived until the end of James II's reign, the property of the earldom seems to have retained by the crown under non-entry.[88] In 1433 the farm of earldom, at £292-2-2, was accounted for by a crown baillie[89] and in 1459 sir Thomas Bully rendered an account as chamberlain of the earldom of Lennox of the rents for a single year,[90] of which only the charge side has survived, while a memorandum in the same year mentioned that the farm of the earldom was assigned to contribute to the building expenses at Stirling castle.[91] In a retour of 23 July 1473, John, lord Darnley was served heir to half the lands of the earldom of Lennox, and it was expressly stated that the Lennox estates had been in royal hands for the previous 48 years, namely since the death of earl Duncan, through the non-entry of any heir and also that Duncan had died 'at the peace and faith of our Lord the King'.[92] It would appear, therefore, that Isabell was prevented from extracting the profits of the earldom at least during the lifetime of James I by ensuring that she did not recover the sasine on the estates, although future succession through Elizabeth and Margaret, the other daughters of earl Duncan, was not forbidden. If the sentence of forfeiture had been pronounced all future claims on the lands and titles of the earldom by those connected to the old line of earl Duncan would have lapsed immediately. There is evidence, however, that during the reign of James II Isabell was in a position to issue charters in her own right.[93] Because earl Duncan had not been forfeited in 1425

---

88. Countess Isabell was held prisoner in Tantallon castle during most of the reign of James I. Paul, The Scots Peerage, v, 343.

89. ER, iv, 589.

90. ER, vi, 548-9.

91. ER, vi, 453, 607.

92. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 96.

93. Fraser, The Stirlings of Keir, 214.

and since he left a legitimate heir, it is clear that James I had no right to enforce the right of non-entry unless Isabell had neglected to take up the sasine to her inheritance. But, what is more probable, is that James did not allow Isabell to assume her right and used the excuse of non-entry to acquire the revenues of the earldom.

Although there are no surviving accounts to substantiate the assertion, it would appear that James I, at least for a substantial part of his reign, retained in his possession the property of the earldom of Ross. On the basis of the resignation of Euphemia, daughter of the last Leslie, earl of Ross, the remainder fell on John, earl of Buchan, and on his death in 1424 it would appear that the earldom remained a royal fief until about 1435.

However, the reign of James I was not totally confined to land grabbing. Of the estates acquired by the crown during the reign of James I, the profits enjoyed by the king were not always as substantial as those received by the previous holder. The prime example is afforded by the earldom of Menteith. Of the earldom held by Robert, duke of Albany, only a portion was later exploited by the crown after its annexation, since part was granted by James I to his brother-in-law, William Edmonstone of Culloden while a further section was received by Malise Graham in compensation for his loss of the earldom of Strathearn. In fact, the break up of the old Celtic earldoms was to be a feature of the fifteenth century. The majority of estates acquired by James I were retained by the crown for their financial contribution to the costs of government, namely the earldoms of Fife, Mar, March, part of Menteith, the lands of Coull, Discher, Toyer and Strathbran, but patronage was not entirely ignored. There was no wholesale redistribution of property as occurred in the fourteenth century, but certain patronage demands were met from the annexed estates; sections of the earldom of Menteith were regranted to Edmonstone of Culloden and Malise Graham while the entire earldom of Strathearn was gifted in liferent to the king's uncle,

Walter, earl of Atholl, the only Stewart relative of the king to escape his disfavour.

Because of the dearth of surviving Ballivi ad Extra and sheriffs' accounts for the reign of James I, it is extremely difficult to estimate the exact amount of landed property which had fallen to the crown by 1437. The sole surviving property accounts for the reign were audited in mid summer 1434 and consisted of Ballivi ad Extra returns from the combined entry of the earldoms of Lennox and Menteith, John Wallace, baillie of Kyle, Thomas Kennedy, baillie of the earldom of Carrick and finally Thomas Cranstone, royal Receiver-General of lands south of the Forth.[94] However, all but the former account appear to have concentrated heavily on the issue of various feudal casualties with only a few entries expressly stated to be the king's property. Despite the frustrating shortage of evidence, there can be little doubt that the territorial annexations undertaken by James I formed the foundation for a permanent royal demesne which was augmented by later kings so as to make a significant contribution to the overall cost of royal government. This radical alteration in attitude of the crown towards annexed property and other incursions into the material and jurisdicational privileges of the baronage were too probably sudden to achieve universal acceptance. Even those magnates unaffected royal action must have been nervous of James's future intentions. Baronial vested interests reacted violently, on the night of 20-21 February 1436-7 James I was murdered by conspirators led by sir Robert Graham, who had been arrested by the king in 1424 and the plot was seemingly the brainchild of Walter, earl of Atholl.[95]

---

94. ER, iv, 589-603.

95. For the arguments concerning the involvement of earl Walter in the murder of James I, see Balfour-Melville, James I, King of Scots, 247. Sir Robert Graham was in fact the uncle of the deprived Malise, earl of Strathearn.

Although such a reaction could not have been wholly unexpected its effect, apart from removing the instigator of the revival of the position of the Scottish crown, failed to bring a reversal of James I's policy. Not only did Atholl not achieve his dynastic ambition as the legitimate heir or Robert II and Euphemia Ross, but also the policy of strengthening the crown both materially and politically, initiated by James I, was resumed with unabated intensity after his death.

C. THE ACCUMULATION OF THE ROYAL DEMESNE 1437-1513

With the accession of James II in 1437 the picture of the constant accumulation of royal estates becomes considerably clearer with an increase in the survival rate of both official and private records. What exactly did the crown gain when an earldom, lordship or barony fell into royal hands? Firstly, the king assumed the title and rights of the earl or lord whereby he now accepted the role of immediate feudal superior within the bounds of the earldom or lordship. The tenants-in-chief of the former earl or lord, from whom they held their lands, now retained their estates of the king, as earl or lord. This arrangement did not alter the position of these tenants but it involved the crown further in the process of subinfeudation. In the role of feudal superior over these estates, the king was entitled to various services and feual incidents from those who retained their holdings directly of the superior. Secondly, the king was also entitled to receive the entire profits due from the property within the earldom or lordship, namely the annual farms, grassums, entries and a variety of services. In fact, the property proved to be the meat of the inheritance since it contributed a regular annual income to the crown, destined to make

significant contributions to the expenses of the royal household. Normally the property formed only a small portion of the area covered by the entire earldom. For instance, in the account of David Kennedy, as baillie of the earldom of Carrick in 1448, the king's property within that territory amounted to only the lands of Girvanhead and Turnberry with an annual farm of only £28-13-4, the remainder having been earlier subinfeudated in the interests of patronage.[96] However, by 1513 with the later annexation of the lands of Trabboch, Leswalt, Menybridge, Blairquhanny and Grenane, the annual profit from the earldom rose to £179-6-10.[97] Although the total annual gross receipt from the earldom of Fife in 1494 amounted to £632-12-1, 58 chalders of wheat, 93 chalders of barley, 67 chalders of oats and a large number of poultry, the land designated 'proprietas domini regis' formed a relatively small portion of the entire earldom and tended to be concentrated in specific areas. As quoted in the Ballivi ad Extra's charge, the portions of royal property were concentrated into five relatively compact segments or quarters, centring round Auchtermuchty, Falkland, Largo, Auldlundoris and the valley of the river Eden, leaving vast tracts within the province where no crown property existed, especially the area round St. Andrews and the region to the south and west.[98] In the earldom of March, crown property again tended to be conventrated in specific areas, in this case the focal points were in the north east around Dunbar and on the English border between Berwick and Melrose, with virtually no property on the west side of the province nor on the east coast south of Cockburnspath.[99] Royal property in the earldom or Mar and lordship of Garioch tended to follow the lines marked out by the rivers Dee and Don. In the north of the

---

96. ER, v, 328.

97. ER, xiii, 516.

98. See Appendix, Map No. 1

99. See Appendix, Map No. 2

province, the majority of crown estates were focused on the lower portion of the river Urie in the Garioch area and mostly on the north bank of the Don west of Alford to beyond Strathdon. In the south, apart from the cluster of estates in Cromar (the area round Tarland), the majority of royal lands followed the line of the river Dee west from Aboyne to beyond Braemar.[100] The situation appears to have been similar in other earldoms and lordships acquired by the crown, the amount of property was small in comparison to the area of superiority.

During the course of the fifteenth century James I's successors continued his policy of territorial aggrandizement. By the reign of James IV the crown had built up large tracts of royal property, the profits from which formed one of the principal fiscal pillars of the royal household. For instance, between November 1498 and March 1499-1500 out of a total income of £10,341 to the comptroller for the expenses of the royal household £6,954 was received from the Ballivi ad Extra from the issues of the royal demesne and in 1509 that source provided £9,692 out of a total revenue of £13,245 delivered to the comptroller.[101] Such a significant financial contribution to the maintenance of the king's household was only possible through the fairly rapid acquisition of estates. Between the death of James I and 1513 the royal demesne was extended by a variety of means.

The first, and in many ways the most important, source of crown land was the result of numerous forfeitures for treason which occurred during the fifteenth century. In late Mediaeval England, there was a gradual extension of the scope of the Act of Attainder. During the fourteenth century only fee simple or freehold estates and a widow's dowry were subject to forfeiture by the crown on the conviction for treason. Although this policy

---

100. See Appendix, Map No. 3

101. ER, xi, 250-5, xiii, 249-254.

was explicity stated in the Statute of Westminster III, the Appellants in 1388 were determined that, on this occasion only, the forfeitures inflicted on members of Richard II's party was to extend to entailed estates.[102] In 1398 Richard II also extended the weapon of forfeiture to entailed estates in his campaign against the three Appellants, the earls of Gloucester, Warwick and Arundel.[103] These extreme measures did not prove to be popular and this version of the Act of Attainder was not enforced again until the forfeiture of the Yorkists in 1459 and thereafter the association between the treason laws and entailed estates continued for the remainder of the fifteenth century. Many individual attainders in the latter half of the fifteenth century were not enforced with the full rigours of the law, some were subsequently repealed and portions of the entailed lands were restored to the original owner, nevertheless, the effect of tightening the laws concerning the forfeiture of property on the extent of the royal demesne was considerable. The vast acquisition of landed property under Edward IV, especially the vary considerable Warwick, Salisbury and Spencer estates coupled with several former royal lordships and estates which returned to the crown in 1478 on the attainder of the duke of Clarence, under Richard III, through the forfeitures resulting from the failure of the rebellion instigated by the earl of Buckingham, and Henry VII through a host of attainders between 1495 and 1504.[104] Although the entails of these estates were included in these forfeitures, it seems to have been an accepted legal convention in fifteenth century England that entailed estates should not be permanently lost to the rightful heirs and the trend was in the direction of the ultimate reversal of attainders. Lander has given practical proof of this trend for,

---

102. Steele, Richard II, 153.

103. Wolffe, Crown Lands, 46.

104. The attainders between 1495 and 1504 included, as detailed in a declaration of 1503-4, sir William Stanley, lord Fitzwalter, Edmund Ashley, the earl of Suffolk, lord Audley, sir William de la Pole and sir James Tyrell. Wolffe, The Crown Lands, 47.

of the thirty two persons above the rank of esquire attained by Henry VII during his reign, nineteen secured a reversal of their attainders from either the same monarch or his son, Henry VIII.[105] Despite this legal convention, forfeited lands contributed considerably to the £40,000 paid annually from royal estates into the king's chamber between 1502-5.[106]

In Scotland, many of the major forfeitures occurred before those in England. Mention has already been made of the employment of the weapon of forfeiture by James I as a means of contributing to the construction of a considerable royal demesne. During the reigns of James II and III sentences of forfeiture against recalcitrant magnates provided the crown with a solid territorial basis in 1488.

Parliament in Scotland was established as the supreme court of law, dealing with cases involving the loss of heritable property, before the wars of independence.[107] The forfeiture of those unwilling to make peace with Robert I involved the perpetual disinheritance of their lands and possessions through the 'judgement given in our parliament, with the consent and agreement of all the clergy, earls, barons and the whole community of the realm'.[108] During the remainder of the later Middle Ages, crimes of treason were judged in Parliament to which the offender was summoned to answer for his crimes.[109] Only Parliament retained the power to pass sentence of forfeiture on any declared rebel, irrespective of his personal appearance at court or not. In general, the sentence of forfeiture in Scotland involved the entire property

---

105. Lander, 'Attainder and Forfeiture, 1453-1509', Historical Journal, iv, 151.

106. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 220. The earlier acquisitions of the English crown were principally achieved through inheritance, (the Lancastrian estates, and the earldom of March) but from the reign of Edward IV, a large proportion of landed estates falling to the crown were the result of Acts of Attainder (the Warwick, Spencer and Salisbury estates and the various attainders of Henry VII).

107. Rait, The Parliaments of Scotland, 130.

108. APS, i, 104.

109. The fate of the earldom claimed by Malise, earl of Strathearn, was judged in Parliament of 1344, for details see Thompson, 'A Roll of Scottish Parliament, 1344'. SHR, 1912.

of the person convicted and also was designed to be an irreversible decision. Although in England the entailed estate was frequently not permanently lost to the offender's heirs, the scope of forfeiture in Scotland tended to be all-embracing. In the sentence of forfeiture pronounced against William, lord Crichton in 1482, it was recorded that as punishment for crimes and treason committed by Crichton against James III, as contained in the summons, 'he has forfalted to our soverance lord his lif his landis his gudis offices and al utheris his possessiouns quhatsumever he had of our soverance lord within the Realme of Scotlande evermare to remain with our soverane lord his airis and successoris as properte for his tressoun and offence'.[110] The decision against James, earl of Douglas, in 1455 mentioned that the earl and his heirs forfeited all the lands, returns, possessions, superiorities, offices, moveable and immoveable goods and all other pertinents to the king, his successors and assignees for ever and in heritage.[111] Strict measures were taken to ensure that the forfeiture was carried out effectively. On 4 August 1455 the Act of Parliament demanded that no person of any status was to 'resset, hous or herbry support or supple be na maner of way James Unquhill Erle of Douglas his brethir complices or anerdance under the payne of tynsaile and forfature of lyf landis and gudis'. In addition, it was stated that no person descended from these traitors who had been forfeited in Parliament were to succeed 'till ony heritage in this Realme in tym to cum'.[112] Those found guilty of treason in Parliament were sentenced to lose both their lives and their possessions. Those unfortunate enough to be arrested and convicted, the duke of Albany and his ons in 1424, Alexander Livingstone and Robert Livingstone, the comptroller in 1449 and Hugh Douglas, earl of Ormond in 1455, were beheaded while those who escaped the clutches of the law normally resigned

---

110. APS, ii, 161.

111. APS, ii, 76.

112. APS, ii, 42.

themselves to a life of exile. Prior to 1488 only a few of those convicted of treason and sentenced to forfeit his possessions were able to achieve restitution. However, on 30 April 1458, nine years after his fall from power, James, lord Livingstone was regranted a substantial proportion of family estates while in 1464 William Cockburn, whose lands were confiscated for the assistance given to the earl of Douglas, was restored to a small part of his original estate.[113]

The forfeiture of the earldoms of Fife and Menteith and other lands belonging to Murdoch, duke of Albany, and the property of the earl of March during the reign of James I involved the entire entailed estate of the offender and the lands involved were still in royal hands in 1513. During the reign of James II large additions were made to the royal demesne established by his father. The bulk of the territorial increase stemmed from the forfeiture of two formidable noble houses, the Atholl estates and the vast Douglas patrimony. Walter Stewart, the second son of Robert II and Euphemia Ross, was one of the principal benefactors of royal patronage during his lifetime, for he received frequent gifts of land not only during the period of largess before 1424, but he also profitted substantially during the period of retrenchment under James I. The estates acquired by the crown after the forfeiture of earl Walter in March 1437 were considerable and reflected the extent of royal favour heaped on him. The lands of the lordship of Brechin, the barony of Navar and other lands in Angus were possessed by Walter Stewart on his marriage to Margaret Barclay, heiress of sir David Barclay of Brechin.[114] Although these lands were annexed by the crown in 1437, it was not without a little difficulty.

---

113. RMS, ii, 606, 788. The majority of Cockburn's estate had been previously gifted to William Douglas of Cluny in January 1463-4. RMS, ii, 775.

114. Registrum de Panmure, ii, 224-5. The other lands which appeared in the 1451 account of the mair, William Niddrie, included Ruthven and Cortachty. ER, v, 448.

Sir Thomas Maule, as heir to Margaret Barclay, claimed the lordship of Brechin in March 1437 by asserting that earl Walter, after his confession to a priest, declared that he retained the lands after his wife's death only by 'courtesy of Scotland', for the duration of his life only, and that since his son David had never been granted the fee of the lordship, sir Thomas Maule was the rightful heir of Margaret.[115] Maule's case appears too circumstantial to have any real chance of success, relying as it did on a 1st minute statement by Atholl, and, in addition, it would have been normal practice for the fee of the lordship to be settled on the son and then the gandson of the marriage.[116] Such a stand was adopted by the crown in 1437 and since Robert, master of Atholl, was convicted of treason along with his grandfather, the lordship was declared forfeit to the crown and Maule's claim was rejected although sir Thomas was compensated with a small portion of the estates.[117] Other estates which fell to the crown on the forfeiture of Atholl included the earldom of Strathearn, granted in liferent to earl Walter by James I after the deprivation of Malise Graham in 1427,[118] the earldom of Atholl itself, bestowed on Walter by Robert, duke of Albany in 1409 and of which there is only a single surviving account, dated 1450, for the entire period of the crown's retention of the earldom,[119] the lordship of Methven and other lands in Perthshire granted to Walter by his father, Robert II, after his accession to the throne.[120] However, before

---

115. Registrum de Panmure, ii, 228-9.

116. The eldest son of the marriage of earl Walter and Margaret Barclay was David who died as a hostage for James I in England after 1434, but his son Robert, master of Atholl would undoubtedly have inherited the fee of the lordship of Brechin.

117. Registrum de Panmure, ii, 235.

118. RMS, ii, 93.

119. ER, vi, 415. The account of Robert Duncanson, baillie of the earldom of Atholl for the year 1449-50 recorded a gross annual farm of £123. There is no evidence that the earl had been regranted by the crown before 1457.

120. The lands of Methven had been granted by Robert I to Robert the Steward. Robertson's Index, 9. RMS, ii, 351.

Atholl's forfeiture, the lands of Dunbarny and Petcathly within the lordship of Methven following a legal technicality.[121] Although the earldom of Caithness was resigned to Walter Stewart by his niece Euphemia, daughter of his eldest brother David, formerly earl of Strathearn and Caithness, in 1402, the earldom was subsequently granted by earl Walter to his youngest son Alan about 1428, a grant confirmed by James I on 15 May 1430 but on his death at the battle of Inverlochy in the following year, the earldom must have reverted to Atholl under the terms of the tailzie.[122] After 1437, although there are no substantiating accounts in the Exchequer Rolls, the earldom of Caithness must also have been included in the Atholl forfeiture and have been retained by the crown as part of the royal demesne until 1452 when George Crichton, the Admiral, was style earl.[123] Despite this uncertainty over the fate of the earldom of Caithness, it is evident from the surviving Ballivi ad Extra rolls that the forfeited Atholl estates contributed a gross annual rent of over £716 to the crown by 1450.[124]

The second windfall of property to the crown, even more extensive than the Atholl estates, occurred with the forfeiture of the enormous Douglas inheritance in 1455. In the same way as the forfeiture of the earl of Atholl had removed a dynastic threat to the crown of James II, the fall of the Douglasses crushed the principal political menace to face the crown in the fifteenth century. Both the material strength, based mainly on the huge territorial possessions of the Douglas family, amassed systematically from the early fourteenth century, and the political influence of the Douglasses were regarded by James II as a very real threat to the continued independence

---

121. ER, vi, 243. Apparently Atholl had granted the lands to Archibald, earl of Douglas who subsequently alienated them to Dundas without the consent of Atholl as superior, the crime of recognition, and, as a result, the court of James I decided that Douglas had resigned the lands to Atholl who conferred them on the king.

122. RMS, ii, 152.

123. RMS, ii, 587.

124. ER, v, 415, 418, 448, 482.

of the crown. The mid fifteenth century conflict between the Yorkists and the Lancastrians in England was to a large extent reflected in Scotland in the 1450s with the struggle between the houses of Stewart and Douglas. Although, in Scotland, the crown eventually triumphed the outcome was by no means certain even a few months before the ultimate victory was achieved. The earl of Douglas possessed immense political influence in the mid fifteenth century, not only within his own locality where a large kin grouping, bonds of manrent, the existence of tenants and vassals who owed service to the earl, judicial and administrative powers and vast land holdings ensured that Douglas was by far the most powerful magnate in the border region, but also at the national level where the earl of Douglas's political and military power was augmented by bonds settled with the earls of Crawford and Ross. Despite the recent advances by the crown in the accumulation of a substantial royal demesne, the Douglas territorial possessions did not fall far short of that retained by the crown. The existence of two large spheres of wealth and influence was incompatable with a stable political atmosphere. James II was no doubt fully aware of the political and material strength of the Douglas challenge which required a quick counteraction on the part of the crown if the Stewart monarchy was to retain its independence from factional dominance. There is sufficient evidence to show that James II openly provoked the Douglas faction into rebellion - the murder of William, earl of Douglas on 22 February 1451 was a prime example[125] and attempted to remove this threat to the authority of the crown before it had achieved an impregnable position.

Although the exact motivation behind James II's actions in the early

---

125. Donaldson has described the murder of earl William as 'unpremeditated and wholly impolitic', the result of his failure to break the bond between Douglas, Ross and Crawford. Donaldson, Scottish Kings, 91. Most of the chroniclers have emphasised the suddenness of the affair, but such an impression could easily have been falsely created to mollify outside opinion. Auchinlek Chronicle, 9-10, 46-7. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, i, 94. Lesley, History of Scotland, 22.

1450s must remain a matter of conjecture, it is certain that the windfall of property that resulted from the defeat and forfeiture of members of the Douglas family proved to be an important turning point in the construction of the royal demesne. The lands assumed by the king in 1455 were so extensive that the crown became, beyond all doubt, the leading landowner in Scotland, achieving a position not dissimilar to that of Edward IV or Henry VII in England.

The territorial basis of the Douglas inheritance was concentrated on the borders and the south west region of Scotland. The principal Douglas estates forfeited to the crown in 1455 consisted of Ettrick Forest, divided into the three wards of Ettrick, Tweed, or Selkirk, and Yarrow, or Traquair, which had been granted to James, lord of Douglas by Robert I as part of the general redistribution of estates after Bannockburn,[126] and the lordship of Galloway which was acquired by the Douglas family in two parts, the lands situated between the rivers Nith and Cree had been granted to sir Archibald Douglas, a natural son of James, lord of Douglas, by David II in 1369,[127] and the lands west of the Cree, erected by David II into the earldom of Wigtown, which Thomas Flemming, earl of Wigtown was forced to sell to sir Archibald Douglas in 1372 on account of his urgent need for ready cash and his inability to control the region.[128] The fate of the lands of Galloway demonstrated clearly the determination of the Douglas family to prevent the alienation of any portion of their patrimony outside the narrow family circle. Although

---

126. RMS, i, App. 2, Index A, 232. The lands were united into a free barony. In 1389 a precept of sasine of the Forest of Selkirk was issued by the chancellor to sir Malcolm Drummond but was quickly rescinded as the concession lacked any official authority. APS, i, 193. Robert III confirmed the gift of the regality of the Forest of Ettrick, the lands of Lauderdale, Romanno and others to Archibald, earl of Douglas. RMS, i, App. 2, Index A, 1817.

127. RMS, i, 329.

128. RMS, i, 507. The sale was dated 8 February 1371-2 and confirmed by Robert II on 7 October.

the traditional Douglas lands were held as entailed estates under the royal confirmation of 1342,[129] the lands of Galloway remained unentailed, with the result that, on the death of William, earl of Douglas in November 1440 without direct male heirs, the inheritance was temporarily divided, the entailed estates passing to James, earl of Avondale, the second son of Archibald 'the Grim', while G lloway and the land acquired through Joan Moray, lady of Both-well, devolved on Margaret, the only sister of earl William. However, to ensure that the estates did not pass out of Douglas control, Margaret was successively married to William and James, the eighth and ninth earls of Douglas.[130] Also, in 1451 James II seems to have made an effort to wrest a portion of the Douglas inheritance from earl William, principally the earldom of Wigtown and the lands of Stewarton, probably based on a royal concession of James I on 3 May 1426 by which Margaret Stewart, countess Douglas was in receipt of a royal gift of the lordship of Galloway only for the duration of her widowhood.[131] The nature of James I's concession sugges-ted that the lands of Galloway were still regarded by the crown as royal property and after the expiry of Margaret's concession, namely at her death, the lands would automatically revert to the crown. However, on 26 October 1451 the lands of Wigtown and Stewarton were confirmed to William, earl of Douglas notwithstanding the crimes committed by him or his predecessors up to the day of the grant.[132] The agreement between James II and William, earl of Douglas on 28 August 1452, whereby the latter undertook 'not to seek

---

129. APS, i, 193-4. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 357-9. On 26 May 1426 Hugh, lord of Douglas resigned the entire Douglas property to David II and three days later received a royal confirmation of the inheritance with a detailed series of remainders to male members of the Douglas family.

130. Papal dispensations were arranged so as to legalise the two marriages. Paul, The Scots Peerage, iii, 178, 183.

131. RMS, ii, 47.

132. RMS, ii, 503, 504. These confirmations were granted with the full deliberation of the three estates in Parliament. APS, ii, 71.

any entrie in the lands of the earldome of Wigtown without the speciall favour and leicence of the queen' and not to claim the lordship of Stewarton without the leave of the king, suggested that James had in fact made an effort to annex these lands but the crown was not yet suitably equipped to openly confront the earl, with the result that on 16 January 1452-3 James II promised to restore these estates to Douglas and to promote the latter's marriage to the Maid of Galloway.[133] In addition, the earl of Douglas was in possession of the lands of Stewarton, bestowed on James Douglas of Balvany by James I on 12 January 1426-7 after the death of John, earl of Buchan.[134] The lordship of Annandale was forcibly resigned by George, earl of March to Archibald, earl of Douglas in 1409 on the occasion of the former's rehabilitation by Albany. The lordship was not, however, included in the forfeitures on 1455 since, on the murder of William, earl of Douglas in 1440, under the terms of the 1409 charter, which had settled succession on the male heirs of earl Archibald or failing on the earls of March, the crown inherited the lordship in place of the forfeited earls of March on the failure of the male Douglas line.[135]

By the 1450s the Douglas influence had spread to most of the regions of Scotland for members of the Douglas clan filled the office of bishop of Aberdeen, and succeeded to the earldoms of Moray and Ormond. The estates and title of a truncated earldom of Moray were granted to John Dunbar in 1372 by Robert II; however on the death of earl James in 1430, the property fell legally to the two co-heiresses, Janet and Elizabeth.[136] The latter was subsequently married

---

133. Fraser, The Douglas Book, i, 483-4.

134. RMS, ii, 77. The lordship of Stewarton had been granted by Archibald, earl of Douglas to John, earl of Buchan on the occasion of his marriage to Elizabeth Douglas, the daughter of earl Archibald, in 1413. RMS, i, 945. However on the charter 1426-7 it was clearly stated that the lands of Stewarton had been resigned by a certain Elizabeth Murray.

135. RMS, i, 920. ER, v, 357. The first recorded account of the steward of Annandale occurred on the entry to office of Herbert, lord of Maxwell sometime before 1449.

136. Pitscottie stated that the earl of Douglas had obtained a gift of the ward and marriage of the younger heiress from James II and arranged her marriage to Archibald Douglas. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, i, 62.

to Archibald Douglas, the third son of James, earl of Douglas who, undoubtedly through influence exerted by the earl of Douglas himself, succeeded to the Moray estates to the rejection of the claim of the elder sister Janet and her husband, sir James Crichton.[137] As a result, on the forfeiture of Archibald, earl of Moray in June 1455[138] the entire Moray inheritance was annexed to the crown, including property in the sheriffdoms of Elgin and Forres, the lands of Glencairny, Leffaris and other estates in the shire of Inverness, the lands of Bonach, Bannachare and the lands of Duffus, and the thanage of Kintore, were conveyed by the last Dunbar earl of Moray to Archibald Douglas in 1442 on the occasion of his marriage to Elizabeth Dunbar and declared in the 1456 account of the chamberlain of Mar as being crown property 'through the forfeiture of Elizabeth of Dunbar, once countess of Moray.[139] On the forfeiture of Hugh Douglas, earl of Ormond, James II acquired the lands of Crimond, in Buchan, the estates of Armeanoch in the Black Isle, part of the Bothwell inheritance which passed to Archibald, lord of Galloway through his marriage to Joan Moray in 1362 and bestowed on Hugh Douglas on his creation as earl of Ormond, and a third of the lands of Duffus in the shire of Elgin.[140] The forfeiture of John Douglas of Balvany at the same juncture provided the crown with further estates, the lands of Balvany, Boharm and Botriphnie in Banffshire, those of Petty and Brackley in the Beauly Firth and also Strathdean in Invernessshire.[141]

---

137. APS, ii, 42, 76-7.

138. ER, vi, 265, 648. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iii 231. The date 1466 recorded in the Antiquities should in fact be 1442. The Thanage of Kintore was granted to John Dunbar by Robert II in 1375. RMS, i, 627.

139. APS, ii, 42, 76-7.

140. In the Exchequer accounts, the region of Ardmeanach was divided into Avach and Eddirdule. Theiner, Vetera Monumenta, No. 647. ER, vi, 212, 265.

141. ER, vi, 265. The lands of Petty, Brackley and Strathdean were also inherited by the Douglas family from the Morays of Bothwells in 1362. On 18 April 1425-6 James I confirmed a charter of Archibald, earl of Douglas to James Douglas of Balvany of the lands of Avach, Eddirdule, Strathdearn, Brauchly, Bocharm and Balvany amongst others. RMS, ii, 43.

These estates represented only the lands forfeited in 1455 and retained as royal property, but not those redeployed in the interests of reward and patronage. For instance, on 28 January 1458-9 the entire lordship of Eskdale was transmitted to one of the principal royal adherents in the recent struggle, George, earl of Angus.[142] Even a quick survey of these properties is sufficient to realise the vast territorial wealth of the Douglas family, concentrating as it did in both the extreme north and south of the country, thus forcing the king to act on two fronts. It would have been virtually impossible for the crown to have timidly accepted the existence of this territorial mass which not only provided the Douglas family with a substantial income but also, being situated fairly distant from the centre of government, these regions remained virtually independent of the crown. The removal of the Douglas menace in 1455 solve the delicate political situation and, in addition, provided the crown with a massive addition to its landed property. Using the accounts recorded in the Exchequer Rolls immediately after the forfeitures of 1455, the gross annual income from the former Douglas estates amounted to over £2,180.[143] The spectacular accumulation of estates by the Douglasses during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries was the result of an astute series of extremely profitable marriages and a steady return from royal patronage.

The reign of James III was fraught with forfeitures and threats of forfeiture. During the twenty eight years of James III's reign several baronial families were summoned to answer accusations of treason. Acts of forfeiture were passed in Parliament against Thomas, earl of Arran, Robert, lord Boyd and sir Alexander Boyd of Drumcoll in November, 1469,[144] against John, earl of Ross in December, 1475,[145] against Alexander, duke of Albany,

---

142. RMS, ii, 670.

143. ER, vi, 331, 339, 343, 360, 371, 374.

144. APS, ii, 186-7.

145. APS, ii, 108-111.

John Ellem of Buttirden and several other border families in October 1479,[146] against duke Alexander, for a second time, and sir James Liddale of Halkerstone in July 1483,[147] against William, lord Crichton, John Liddale, David Purves and others in December 1483[148] and finally against James Gifford of Sheriff-hall in May 1485.[149] Apart from the Boyds and the earl of Ross, the remaining Acts of Attainder during the reign of James III were directed at persons who had assisted the treasonable activities of Albany, either by communicating with forces in England, 'stuffing' the castle of Dunbar, or participating in overt lawlessness and destruction. In addition to processes of forfeiture actually followed through, on 18 March 1481-2 Robert, lord Lyle was accused of transmitting letters to James, earl of Douglas in England and to certain Englishmen 'in a treasonably manner' and also to have received letters 'to the prejudice of the king' but he was subsequently declared innocent of the crimes.[150] From 4 October 1479 to 5 June 1480 Patrick Hume of Polworth and George Hume of Wedderburn were persistantly summoned to answer for support given to the rebels lodged in Albany's castle of Dunbar, for violation of the truce with England and for murder and wastage committed against the crown, but after the latter date their names were removed from the summonses issued against Albany and his supporters.[151] The weapon of forfeiture was constantly in evidence during the reign of James III, especially during the crisis years of 1479 to 1483 and apart from the actual Acts of Forfeiture which were effectively pursued by the crown the uneasiness felt by other landowners who had been involved with Albany or present at the murder of the king's 'favourites'

---

146. APS, ii, 129-132.

147. APS, ii, 147-152.

148. APS, ii, 154-164.

149. APS, ii, 173.

150. APS, ii, 137.

151. APS, ii, 128-130.

at Lauder Bridge in 1482, must have been considerable. A similar situation existed among many of the leading landowners in late fourteenth century England, especially the Appellants, during the 1390s after thepolitical crisis of 1386-8. Insecurity and uncertainty as to the future actions of Richard II was seen to have been a realistic fear for, in 1397, three of the Appellants, Gloucester, Arundel and Warwick were attainted, the latter only escaping execution and again in 1399 with Richard's attempts to disinherit Henry Bolingbroke of his Lancastrian estates. The reaction cost Richard II his throne. In the same way a similar fear of future royal recriminations must have been a powerful factor in the violent baronial reaction against James IIIin 1488 since many of those opposing the crown in 1488 were in fact either in collusion with Albany or were involved in the king's imprisonment in Edinburgh castle earlier in the reign.

However, during the reign of James III substantial territorial acquisitions were achieved following various Acts of Forfeiture. The sudden fall of the Boyd faction in 1469 resulted in the further addition of property to the crown. The lands of Tealing, Polgavy and an annual rent from Brichty in Forfarshire, and the baronies of Kilmarnock, Dalry, Kilbride, Nodisdale with the lands of Nariston, Railstone, and Monefode in the south west, property previously held by Robert, lord Boyd, coupled with the estates of Arran, certain lands within the lordship of Stewarton, Terrenzeane, Turnberry, Risedalemure and the large Cumbrae, granted to Thomas Boyd, earl of Arran on the occasion of his marriage to Mary, sister to James III on 26th April 1467, were forfeited in 1469.[152] During the minority of James III the Boyds had constructed a substantial block of property in the south west but the uncertain nature of their political support, and the jealousy aroused over their spectacular political and material advancement, enabled the king to oust them from power.

---

152. RMS, ii, 912-5. The lands of Kilmarnock, Dalry, Kilbride, Nodisdale, Nariston, Railston, Rysdalemure were granted to queen Margaret in liferent on 25 June 1470, and she retained possession of the property until her death in 1487. The lands were united into the free barony of Kilmarnock. RMS, ii, 992. ER, x, 44.

James III made the initial inroad into the vaşt political and social complex which formed the confederation of the Isles under the domination of John, earl of Ross and lord of the Isles. Probably on the discovery by the crown of treasonable communications between the earl of Ross and certain parties in England in 1462, but more definitely on account of earl John's associations with the earl of Douglas in the 1450s and his persistent ravaging of royal property in the Highlands,[153] James III reacted by summoning him to answer for treasonable acts before Parliament in October 1475, and on his failure to comply, an Act of Forfeiture was passed against him on 1 December.[154] Although on 15 July 1476 earl John found it ex;edient to submit to James and received back large portions of his forfeited estate, certain lands, principally the earldom of Ross, with a gross annual rent of £273-6-8, 46 chalders of barley, 38 chalders of oatmeal, 14 chalders of oats, 51 marts and 49 sheep, and the lands of Urquhart and Glenmoriston at £100 annual farm which had been in the hands of the earl of Ross as keeper of Urquhart castle.[155]

Despite the amount of litigations in the Parliamentary Rolls and the number of persons who were attainted during the period from 1479 to 1485, it was only from the duke of Albany, the king's brother, that any additions were made to the royal demesne. The final forfeiture of Alexander, duke of Albany,

---

153. ER, vii, 20, 128, 235, 357, 513.

154. APS, ii, 109-111.

155. APS, ii, 113. ER, viii, 415, 596. The lands of Knapdale and Kintyre were also permanently forfeited by the lord of the Isles, but not retained by the crown. The lands of Urquhart had been granted by Robert II to his son, David, earl of Strathearn in 1371. RMS, i, 537. In 1385 earl David complained before the king's council that his brother, Alexander, earl of Buchan, the 'Wolf of Badenoch', had forcibly taken possession of the lands of Urquhart and thirteen years later the crown took possession of the estates in order to restore order. APS, i, 189, 209. The lands and castle were still in royal hands in 1448 but in 1452 the earl of Ross had assumed control. Auchinlek Chronicle, 15, 43. ER, vi, 313. In 1456 the earl of Ross was given a liferent grant of the lands and castle of Urquhart. ER, vi, 217.

the brother of James III, in 1483 merely witnessed the return of former royal property, which, according to the circumstances and the status of Alexander, the crown had been compelled to alienate. When the treacherous Albany was finally removed from the kingdom in 1483, the crown resumed its claim to the estates of the earldom of March and the lordship of Annandale, conferred on duke Alexander around 1455 not long after his birth[156] and also to the earldoms of Mar and Garioch, which had been gifted by James III to Albany sometime between 29 September and 10 October 1482 as part of the honours heaped on Albany during his brief period of rehabilitation in late 1482 and early 1483.[157] The fate of the earldom of Mar prior to the grant to Albany in 1482 has been a bone of contention, since there are no surviving accounts of the rents and profits derived from these estates between 11 June 1471 and Martinmas 1483.[158] Until 1479 the estates of Mar were undoubtedly held by the king's younger brother, John, earl of Mar, but between his death in that year, not without the hint of treason and plotting, and the grant to Albany in 1482 no accounts for Mar have survived. This gap in the records coincides with the period in which Thomas Cochrane was credited by several chroniclers with the title of earl of Mar. Since there are no official records of this concession by James III to his 'favourite' and indeed it is extremely unlikely if any such gift was even contemplated, the most plausible explanations are either that the

---

156. SRO, Calendar of Charters, ii, No. 342. During the minority of the duke of Albany the profits of the earldom of March were paid into the royal coffers but this arrangement ceased after 1467 when duke Alexander personally assumed control over his estates. ER, vii, 491.

157. RMS, ii, 1541. Through the agency of Schevez, archbishop of St. Andrews and lord Avondale, Albany was temporarily reconciled to the king and on 11 December 1482 he was appointed Lieutenant General of the Realm. APS, ii, 143. Part of the temporary settlement included the restoration of Albany's estates, including the earldom of March and lordship of Annandale, and offices. The grant of the estates of Mar and Garioch was presumably an additional concession, extracted from James III by Albany on the pretext of a reward for his part in the deliverance of James III from his uncles, the earls of Atholl and Buchan, who had imprisoned the unfortunate monarch in Edinburgh castle.

158. ER, viii, 77, ix, 278, 280. From Martinmas 1483 the accounts of the earldom of Mar were divided into two sections, Strathdee and Cromar on the one hand and Garioch and Strathdon on the other, under their respective accountants, Alexander Gordon of Midmar and George, earl of Huntly, both as leasees.

Ballivi ad Extra accounts have failed to survive, that the profits from these estates had been diverted by the crown to some other use in connection with the English invasion by the duke of Gloucester.

The rebellion of 1488 was, to a substantial degree, the result of anxiety, not only over the king's obvious vindictiveness towards certain participants in the crisis years of 1479-83, as displayed by the series of territorial confiscations, but also over the king's future policy, especially towards those who had escaped retribution in the early 1480s but had undoubtedly been active during the crisis years. Archibaldn, earl of Angus and Andrew, lord Gray, both inveterate rebels who, whether or not they actually participated in the hangings at Lauder Bridge in 1482 as legend has related, but appear to have been in league with Albany, the two Hume lairds, and Lord Lyle, who were summoned before Parliament for their treasonable assistance to Albany and subsequently absolved, and the earl of Buchan, who seems to have assumed a prominent role in the activities of those years, must have sat uneasily on their estates. The massive forfeitures during the three year crisis demonstrated James III's ruthlessness while the delayed attainder of James Gifford of Sheriffhall in 1485 for his association with Albany revealed James's reluctance to forgive. In an indenture of March 1482-3 issued by James III, probably in response to the revelation of Albany's further intrigues with England, certain associates, named as Angus, Buchan, Crichton, sir James Liddale and sir John Douglas were to cease their communications with England and were compelled to resign certain offices.[159] It is significant that most of these persons charged with treasonable co-operation with Albany were, like Albany, border magnates. Of these rebels in 1479-83, Crichton and Liddale

---

159. APS, xii, 31-3. For instance, the earl of Buchan was to resign his offices of chamberlain, warden of the Middle March, keeper of Newark and Methven castles and the earl of Angus was to be removed from the office of justiciar south of the Forth, steward of Kirkcudbright, sheriff of Lanark and keeper of Threave castle.

were forfeited by the crown and Buchan was subsequently reaccepted into royal favour, the remainder formed the basis of the rebel army in 1488. A further threat of forfeiture in 1487 caused the estrangement of the powerful border families of Hume and Hepburn from the king. It was James's intention to annex half the profits of the priory Coldingham, traditionally associated with the family of Hume, to support the new Chapel Royal at Stirling castle and any attempt to oppose this transfer was to be stifled with the threat of the forfeiture of 'life, lands and goods'.[160] Also in 1487 James III secured the backing of Innocent VIII in his scheme for diverting the revenues of the priory of Coldingham which represented a complete reversal of the same pope's earlier decision in favour of the Humes.[161] The Coldingham controversy was essentially a financial one but one which also seems to have aroused deep resentment for, not only did the Humes and the Hepburns side with the rebel in 1488, but there were even earlier signs of discontent since the Parliament of 11 January 1487-8 mentioned that 'the temporal personis that has attemptit or done incontrare the said act and statute be summond to a certaine day of Maij nest tocum to ansuer apon the said crimes', probably a reference to members of the Hume family.[162]

The defeat and death of James III at Sauchieburn in 1488 relieved the pressure on certain landowners and the relative clemancy with which the defeated were treated resulted in no additional estates falling to the crown during this period. Even after the 1489 rebellion of Matthew, earl of Lennox, Robert, lord Lyle and Matthew Stewart, the Act of Forfeiture initiated against these rebels

---

160. APS, ii, 179.

161. The Papal bull allocated half the revenues of the priory of Coldingham to the proposed chapel royal and the other half to the erection of a collegiate church at Coldingham itself. Herkless and Hanney, Archbishops of St. Andrews, i, 132-3.

162. APS, ii, 182.

in June 1489 was annulled by the crown in February 1489-90 whereby the entry of forfeiture in the Parliamentary books was to be destroyed and the former rebels were to be restored to their lands and possessions.[163] After the initial processes of forfeiture against John Ramsey, lord Bothwell, and John Ross of Mongrenane most of the other supporters of James III were reconciled to the new regime, the earl of Buchan received an unconditional pardon, while David, earl of Crawford was gifted a liferent grant of his dukedom of Montrose and the other ancillary concessions which he had received in heritage from James III prior to Sauchieburn.[164] The political tranquility of the reign of James IV was principally the result of the freedom from the threat of territorial confiscation which had pervaded the reign of James III, a fact which was reflected in the lack of Parliamentary Acts of Forfeiture. The sole exception of this scene of political tranquility was found in the north west of Scotland where the power of the lord of the Isles, already pruned by James III, was at such a low ebb that the once powerful magnate was unable to control or restrain his vassals. Sometime before August 1503, and probably in May of that year, John, lord of the Isles was removed from the scene, his lands and possessions were forfeit to the crown and he was sustained as a member of the royal household until his death four years later.[165] The vacuum left by the departure of the lord of the Isles led to a state of considerable unrest in the Highlands for the next decade, principally through the efforts of Torquil MacLeod, based at Stornoway, to fill the void. Many Highland

---

163. APS, ii, 213, 217.

164. APS, ii, 201-6, 213, 215. RMS, ii, 1725, 1895. In 1488 only ten of the late king's supporters were summoned, the earl of Buchan, lord Forbes, sir Alexander Dunbar, the lairds of Amisfield, Cockpule, Fotheringham, Innermeath and Innes, lord Bothwell and sir John Ross of Montgrenane and only the latter two suffered forfeiture, partly because they were 'owre the Border and awa'.

165. RMS, ii, 2172. The Acts of Attainder was probably enacted in the Parliament of 31 May 1493 but there is no actual evidence for this. TA, i, 233, 235, 266, 308.

magnates were summoned to answer crimes of treasons in Parliament between 1503 and 1505, including John, earl of Atholl, Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy, Nigel Stewart of Fortingall, John McLean of Lochbuie, Alexander Robertson of Strowan, MacNeil of Barra, MacQuarrie of Ulva, and Lauchlan McLean of Duart, but the Acts of Forfeiture was only enacted against Torquil MacLeod of Lewis and John Lindsay of Wauchop, the latter in response to his deforcement and murder of Bartholemew Glendinning, a royal officer and sheriff 'in that part'.[166] James IV's efforts to control the Highland regions met with temporary success, and certain estates devolved on the crown as a result. From 1 August 1502 Archibald, earl of Argyle accounted to the Exchequer for the rents of the lands of north and south Kintyre, which, after the various kind rents had been commuted into cash, in 1506, contributed a gross annual farm of £385-12s.[167] The only other indication of the lands forfeited to the crown from the lord of the Isles occurred in 1507 with the charge side of accounts from the Island of Ilay, valued at £170-0-4 annually by 'old extent', excluding lands held in mortmain, Colonsay, Swinfort and Jura.[168] Although the forfeiture of the lord of the Isles brought considerable property into the crown's possession, apart from Kintyre, the crown seems to have derived little financial benefit from the settlement. However, apart from these exceptions, which little affected the political climate of the rest of Scotland, the reign of James IV represented a period of political security which undoubtedly owed its existence to the construction of a secure and permanent royal demesne, principally through the weapon of forfeiture as exercised by James I, II and III.

As mentioned in connection with the sheriffs' accounts, a small proportion

---

166. APS, ii, 240, 247, 255-266.

167. ER, xii, 577-80.

168. ER, xii, 587-590.

of royal property was still under the control of that official rather than the usual Ballivi ad Extra. Most of the estates in this category were only temporarily in royal possession and in the majority of cases little has survived concerning the history of these lands. A quarter of the lands Chechis, at 5 marks annual farm, were recorded in the account of the sheriff of Aberdeen in 1471 as being 'the king's property' through the forfeiture of the late John St. Michael,[169] while in 1456 the sheriff of Lanark accounted for the 10s annual farm of Stanhouse, which fell to the crown on the forfeiture of Beatrix, countess of Douglas a year earlier.[170] The rents from the lands of the lordship of Bothwell were collected by the sheriff of Lanark in 1471,[171] but from 6 March 1472-3 the profits from the lordship were received by Thomas Simpson of Knockhill, as royal receiver.[172] The lordship of Bothwell, inherited by the Douglas family through the 1362 marriage between Archibald Douglas, lord of Galloway and Joan Moray, lady of Bothwell, was not included in the 1455 forfeitures.[173] The lands probably remained in the possession of Euphemia, widow of 5th earl of Douglas until her death in 1468, when the lands fell to the crown except for the Martinmas term of 1472,[174] when in the hands of Princess Mary, the sister of James III. Moreover, the lands of Drumcoll, forfeited by sir Alexander Boyd in 1469, were firstly granted to John, lord Carlyle on 31 October 1477 but on their return to the crown soon after

---

169. ER, viii, 31. In 1452 the lands of Creichis and Bothelny in Aberdeenshire were mortgaged by John St. Michael to William Barclay of Grantully for a debt of £46-13-4. RMS, ii, 589.

170. ER, vi, 160.

171. ER, viii, 15.

172. ER, viii, 174.

173. RMS, ii, 479. The lands of Bothwell were included in the confirmations by James II to William, earl of Douglas, in July 1451.

174. In the Martinmas term of 1472, the farms of the lordship of Bothwell were transferred to Mary but the payment ceased around the time of her marriage to James, lord Hamilton. ER, viii, 174. Euphemia was styled lady of Bothwell and subsequently married James, lord Hamilton, and on her death, lord Hamilton married lary Mary, the ex-wife of Thomas Boyd, the forfeited earl of Arran. ER, vii, 530.

Sauchieburn, Drumcoll was leased to Alexander Boyd and Robert Muirhead for an annual farm of 100 marks and the rent was paid to the sheriff of Dumfries.[175]

Apart from the forfeiture of great noblemen for treason, as recorded in the Parliamentary records, smaller estates were being continually escheated to the crown for a variety of offences. However, most of the confiscated lands were quickly regranted to the benefactors of royal patronage, as in the case of the lands of Blareschenach, the crofts of Cullen and certain annual rents from Ord, Monbrey, Baldavy and Petnabrunyeane, which were forfeited by sir William Lindsay of Rossy during the reign of James I and redistributed to John Sellar, the king's butler, for his fee.[176]

Compared with England, the treason laws in Scotland as enacted between 1424 and 1488 were more severe since the loss of goods, lands, offices and possessions tended to be largely all-embracing and permanent. However, the accused was allowed to conduct his defence in Parliament and it was not uncommon for the charge to be dropped, as in the case of lord Lyle in March 1481-2.[177] In fact, those who failed to appear at the trial tended to be automatically found guilty and suffered the sentence of forfeiture of life, lands and goods. Conviction for treason was accompanied by the death penalty, beheading was the normal method employed and only in the case of Walter, earl of Atholl, in 1437 were any of the crudities detailed in English executions used.[178] In addition, until 1488 the forfeiture of lands and goods tended to be irrevocable and even the heirs of the traitor were excluded from inheriting the possessions in question, but during the reign of James IV a certain degree of leniency was introduced. For example, of the two persons forfeited by the

---

175. APS, ii, 186-7. RMS, ii, 1327. ADA, 121. ER, x, 637, xi, 312.

176. ER, v, 207.

177. APS, ii, 183

178. For details of the gory death of the earl of Atholl and his associates, ER, v, xli.

initial Parliaments of the reign of James IV, sir John Ramsey, lord Bothwell, one of the 'favourites' of James III, and sir John Ross of Montgrenane, both were later rehabilitated by James IV.[179] On 17 October 1488 the lands of Montgrenane were granted to Patrick Hume of Fastcastle but by 18 November 1490 the lands had been retrieved by sir John Ross.[180] As before 1488 sir John Ross received payments and fees from crown farms in Stewarton and Kilmarnock, but there is no trace of the 1489 grant, registered in the Great Seal records, of the gift of property in the lordship of Kinclavin.[181] The forfeiture of John Ramsey, lord Bothwell in 1488 resulted in the dispersion of his estates, the lands of Bothwell to Patrick Hepburn, the newly created earl of Bothwell, Maw in Fife and lands in Carrick to Alexander Hume and the lands of Cowgate to Robert Colville, director of the chancery.[182] However, on 18 April 1497 John Ramsey was in receipt of a letter of remission and rehabilitation from Jmes IV and nine days later was gifted the royal property of Tealing and Polgavy in Forfarshire, Terrenzean in Ayr and Kirkandrews within the lordship of Galloway, valued at £98 and 2 chalders of oats, in liferent.[183] Ramsey seems to have retained a similar hold over James IV as he had over his father since he was soon engaged in letting crown property, and acting as auditor of the Exchequer,[184] while in 1500 he submitted 100 marks to the treasurer for the marriage and relief resulting from the death of William Hay of Park and in 1510 he had amassed sufficient capital to pay a composition of £2,210 for the temporary possession of the lands of Balmain, in royal hands through the non-entry of the earl of

---

179. APS, ii, 201-6.

180. RMS, ii, 1785, 1989.

181. ER, x, 267, 272-3, 338, 416, 700. On 24 October 1489 sir John Ross received a grant of the lands of Innernyte, Ballathuis, and Tulybeltanys in the lordship of Kinclevin, valued at 42 marks annual farm.

182. RMS, ii, 1784, 1790, 1797, 1841.

183. RMS, ii, 2348, 2349, 2453, ER, xi, 104, 191, 347.*

184. ER, xi, 283, 431-2, xii, i, 623.

Rothes.[185]

As well as direct confiscation, the crown amassed landed property in other ways. The death of Elizabeth, countess of Buchan without heirs, sometime before 1451, resulted in portions of her inheritance falling to the crown; the lands of Tillicoultry in Clackmannanshire, granted by Robert, duke of Albany to Elizabeth and John, earl of Buchan and confirmed by James I in February 1425-6 whose son claimed the lands through the remainder which had been fixed on the forfeited duke Murdoch,[186] the lands of Coull in Aberdeenshire, granted to John, earl of Buchan by Robert III,[187] and the lands of the lordship of Garioch, gifted by James II, on the death of Alexander, earl of Mar, to the countess of Buchan and her husband, sir Thomas Stewart, and afterwards to the countess in her widowhood.[188] The gross annual farm from the estates inherited from the countess of Buchan amounted to £179-1-8.[189]

During the reign of James III the crown fell heir to certain estates. On the death of Mary of Guelders in 1463, James III inherited the barony of Kirkandrews in Dumfriesshire which lands were later placed under the management of the chamberlain of Galloway.[190] The property had originally been granted to the queen on 15 April 1459 on the resignation of John Shaw.[191] On the same date Mary also received a gift of the lands of Manuel, valued at £20,

---

185. TA, ii, 16. RMS, ii, 3460.

186. RMS, ii, 37.

187. ER, v, 516. RMS, i, App 1, 155.

188. ER, v, 55. The crown's occupation of the lordship of Garioch was delayed by the 1452 grant of the lands of Mary of Guelders for the duration of her life. RMS, ii, 592. On her death in December 1463, the lordship of Garioch was included in the accounts of David Scrimgeour, chamberlain of the king's lands north of the Tay from 8 January 1463-4. ER, vii, 349.

189. ER, v, 519, 588, vii, 460.

190. ER, vii, 271, ix, 245.

191. RMS, ii, 694.

through the resignation of John, lord Somerville, incorporated, after the death of the queen, within the account of John Henrieson, sergeant of Linlithgow and royal receiver within that shire.[192] On the death of George Douglas of Leswalt, an illegitimate branch of the main Douglas stock, all his landed possessions were conceded to Mary of Guelders on 16 October 1463 and on her death, the inheritance, detailed as the lands of the baronies of Leswalt, Menebrig and Barquhanny, with an annual farm of £70-2-6, was transferred to the king and administered on his behalf by Gilbert, lord Kennedy, baillie of Carrick.[193] Although it was still stated in the early accounts that the lands were in royal ward through the death of George Douglas, nevertheless, the crown had made a lasting claim on the estates.[194] Thus, it can be seen that the crown also extended its property by more peaceful methods and that considerable additions were made to the royal demesne, apart from the lands quoted in her jointure, on the death of Mary of Guelders.

On 8 September 1468 a marriage contract was arranged between James III and Margaret, daughter of Christian I of Denmark. The majority of Mediaeval marriage contracts tended to favour the bridegroom and this was to prove no exception. Although Margaret was assigned the usual jointure, a third of the revenues of the Kingdom, for the duration of her life, James III's gains were far more concrete. Christian remitted the 100 marks annual payment instituted in 1266 following the cession of the Hebrides and other northern islands after the battle of Largs, along with the arrears which had accumulated through the persistent non payment of the sum by successive kings of Scotland and also conceded a dowry of 60,000 Rhenish florins, of which 10,000 was to be submitted in cash and in place of the remaining 50,000 florins, the islands of Orkney were

---

192. RMS, ii, 695. ER, vii, 254.

193. RMS, ii, 762. ER, vii, 271, 390. The lands were incorporated within the accounts of the baillie of Carrick after 1466. ER, vii, 450.

194. The lands were still in royal hands in 1513. ER, xiii, 516.

to be mortgaged to the Scottish crown.[195] Through Christian's inability or unwillingness to forward the original 10,000 florins, the islands of Shetlands were handed over to Scotland on similar terms as those of Orkney.[196] Although Christian, in theory, retained the right of redemption on the payment of the debt, it has been suggested that such an eventuality was never contemplated by either monarchs. The mortgage, rather than a straight concession, was employed as a face saving device since it would seen that Christian was relatively disinterested in the fate of these islands, over which he had little control and gained even less profit.[197] The islands of Orkney and Shetland became crown property in September 1470 when William, earl of Caithness was encouraged to exchange the islands for the castle of Ravenscraig, the lands of Carberry, Dubbo and Wilston, located close to the castle and available through the death of Mary of Guelders, an annual pension of 400 marks from the customs of Edinburgh for the life of earl William, the licence to reside anywhere in Scotland or outside, with the exception of England, a lifetime freedom from attendance at Parliament, judicial courts, embassies, military expeditions and royal service, quittance from all demands, exactions or claims sought or to be sought by the Danish king and finally confirmation of all his possessions and his offices of Justiciar, chamberlain and sheriff inside the earldom of Caithness.[198] Although many of the concessions ceased on the death of earl William, the latter seems to have been well compensated for his loss both in 1470 and earlier in 1455 or 1456 when earl William received a grant of the earldom of Caithness from James II on

---

195. ER, viii, pp lxxviilxxxvii.

196. Crawford, 'The Pawning of Orkney and Shetland, SHR, xlviii, 52-3.

197. Ibid, 38.

198. RMS, ii, 996-1002. In the great seal charter the annual pension from the Edinburgh was quoted as 50 marks, but the custumars were allowed an annual payment of 400 marks to the earl of Caithness. ER, viii, 120, 190, 253, 312, 390, 466, 546, 630. The lands and castle had been in the king's hands since the death of Mary of Guelders.

the resignation of sir George Chrichton the previous year.[199]

The extent of the royal demense was affected by a series of exchanges of property with vassals, designed to consolidate royal territory. The lands of Wra in Linlithgowshire were acquired by the crown in1456 through an exchange with sir George Crichton of Carnis.[200] James II gained possession of the Mains of Abercorn in an exchange with the bishop of Dunkeld about the same time, the latter received the lands of Arntully and Muckersie in Perthshire in return.[201] Around 1455 James II also secured possession of the lands of Cornton in Stirlingshire which had belonged to Thomas Fraser of Cornton, who, in exchange, was hereditarily infeft in the lands of Muchal and Stoneywood in Aberdeenshire.[202] James II appears to have gone to considerable lengths to acquire the lands of Cornton, between 1438 and 1450 Fraser was in receipt of £20 annually from farms north of the Dee or from the customs returns from the burgh of Aberdeen[203] in compensation for royal occupation of the lands of Cornton and between 1451 and 1454 Fraser was submitted the same allowance from the lands of Muchal.[204] It is not difficult to discover the reason behind the king's desire to possess the lands of Cornton, being located in the fertile district just north of Stirling castle, and the lands offered to Fraser in exchange had been let by the crown for a total farm of £38-13-4.[205] Although in the Whitsun term of 1455 the lands of Cornton

---

199. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 81-2. Part of the explanation behind the grant of the earldom of Caithness to earl William was as compensation for the surrender of his rights in the lordship of Nithsdale and the sheriffdom of Dumfries.

200. ER, vi, 321.

201. ER, vi, 242, ix, 395. RMS, ii, 3102.

202. ER, vi, 64, 69.

203. ER, v, 55, 96, 134, 188, 234, 270, 306, 342, 389.

204. ER, v, 463, 516, 600, 656.

205. ER, vi, 69. The lands of Muchal were leased for an annual farm of £18-13-4, excluding the annual rent of 10 marks conceded to Fraser by James II. RMS, ii, 134. The lands of Stoneywood were valued at £20.

returned a farm of only £20 annually to the baillie of the king's lands in Stirlingshire, when the lands were leased anew for a grain farm, it amounted to the much more valuable return of 5 chalders of wheat and 2 chalders of oats.[206] There can be little doubt that these changes were conducted by the crown with an eye to financial and strategic advantage. James IV granted the lands at the east and west confines of the burgh of Linlithgow to the abbot of Holyrood in exchange for the lands on which he constructed the royal docks at Newhaven.[207]

The lands of Kinninmont, Bochrum and half the lands of Clunymore, valued in the past at £20 annually, were annexed by the crown as royal property when a great assise held at Aberdeen, in the reign of James I, found that the late David Gardin had died a bastard and that the lands were escheated to the crown.[208]

Before 1450, the shortage of Ballivi ad Extra accounts has rendered it an extremely difficult task to determine the exact date of the acquisition of certain portions of royal property. However, the existance of arrears totals in many of the first recorded accounts quoted in the Exchequer Rolls, proves the existance of earlier accounts.[209] It is not known exactly when the lands of Kinclaven, granted in January 1382-3 by Robert II to his illegitimate son, John Stewart of Cardney, devolved on the crown, although probably on the latter's death.[210] Also there is no evidence as to when the lands of Strathgartney, surrendered by Robert, earl of Fife and Menteith to John Logy in 1385,

---

206. ER, vi, 64, 238, vii, 25.

207. ADC, iii, 131. ER, xii, 573. RMS, ii, 2864. The exchange was affected in July 1505 whereby 112 acres of land near Linlithgow swopped for 143 acres of land in the regality of Broughton, close to the Forth.

208. ER, vi, 264.

209. ER, vi, 474, 482.

210. RMS, i, 729. In 1450 the comptroller, sir Alexander Napier, received a cash return from John Haitley, the receiver of Strathurd and Kinclaven. ER, vi, 392.

were returned to the crown.[211] The three thanages of Fettercairn, Kincardine and Aberbethnot, the finst recorded account of which began in 1458, were among the estates resigned by Euphemia, countess of Ross in 1415 in favour of the house of Albany and although the earldom of Ross was restored to the legal heir in the reign of James I, the three thanages appear to have been retained by the crown.[212]

The controversy over the destiny of the earldom of Mar which raged during most of the reign of James II is the prime example of the nature and exterity of baronial reaction against the territorial pretentions of the Scottish crown during the fifteenth century. On the death of Alexander, earl of Mar in 1435, James I, under the terms of the charter of August 1404 and the confirmation of 1426,[213] which excluded any mention of the heirs of Isabell, countess of Mar, in the remainder, assumed possession of the earldom as the heir of earl Alexander. With the minority of James II, Robert, lord Erskine set about laying his claim to half the earldom of Mar and Garioch, based on his mother, Janet Barclay, whose descent could be traced back to Gardney, earl of Mar.[214]

On the death of earl Alexander, Robert, lord Erskine acted smartly. On 17

---

211. The lands of Strathgartney were acquired by David II in an exchange with sir Robert Erskine, who, in return, was granted lands in Clackmannan. APS, i, 171. Although not part of the old earldom of Menteith, the lands of Strathgartney seem to have come into the possession of Robert, earl of Fife and Menteith, from whom they were claimed by John Logy. Fraser, The Red Book of Menteith, ii, 238, 260. The lands of Strathgartney were accounted for by the chamberlain of Menteith during the fifteenth century. ER, v, 391.

212. ER, vi, pp xcii, 621.

213. The Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 167. RMS, ii, 53. The nature of this claim was confirmed on 16 April 1476. RMS, ii, 1239.

214. Janet Barclay or Keith was the daughter of sir Edward Keith of Sinton and Christine Menteith, the latter, in turn, being the daughter of sir John Menteith and Helen of Mar. Helen of Mar was apparently the daughter of Gartney, earl of Mar. Paul, The Scots Peerage, vi, 598-9.

November 1435 he entered into an indenture with sir Alexander Forbes, the sheriff depute of Aberdeen, whereby the latter, in return for the gift of the lands of Auchindor, promised to aid Erskine in the pursuance 'til al thar rychtis of the erldomis of Marr and Garuioch with the pertenence and bring tham thar to in als fer as his gudli power may streke and nothir spar for cost na trauale', and on 22n April and 16 October 1438, Erksine attempted to consolidate his pretensions through obtaining two special retours of service upholding his rights as heir of Isabell, countess of Mar.[215] The two inquests, presided over by sir Alexander Forbes, recognised the position of countess Isabell as the basis of any legal succession to the earldom, earl Alexander having only held the earldom as a liferent gift from Isabell, and found Erskine her legal heir to both halves of the earldom.[216] Against this 'fait accompli' the crown, weakened temporarily by the minority of James II, successfully postponed any final discussion on the question and mollified Erskine with short term concessions until it was in a stronger position. In 1440 an indenture between the king and Robert Erskine temporarily conveyed the castle of Kildrummy to the latter with the provisos that the stronghold was to be surrendered freely when the king had attained his majority and that Erskine should give up control of Dumbarton castle on the day of his entry to Kildrummy. In addition, Erskine was granted 'the froytis and revenowes belangand half the erledome of Marre' for the duration of this agreement and on the date of expiry 'to be countable give the castell beis jugeit til the king allowand til him a sufficient fee for the kepying of the said castell'.[217] However, during the period when the Erskine

---

215. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 188-9. Crawford, The Earldom of Mar, i, 263-4

216. Concerning the April retour, Erskine was declared the legal heir of Isabell in half the earldom of Mar, the lordship of Garioch having been gifted to Elizabeth, countess of Buchan, widow of sir Thomas Stewart, the illegitimate son of earl Alexander, in liferent by James I. The October retour stated that the other half had been in royal ward for two and a half years as the legal heir, Robert, lord Erskine had failed to pursue his right.

217. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 192. APS, ii, 55. Crawford, Earldom of Mar, i, 268-9.

claim remainded in limbo, the crown seems to have acted with considerable faithlessness. On 9 August 1442 Erskine protested that the chancellor had refused to sanction his legal entry to the lordship of Garioch and recognise his possession of Kildrummy castle, stating that 'he might and should be free to intromit, at his own hand, with the haill lands of Marr and Garrioch'.[218] Frustration appears to have encouraged Erskine to forcibily capture the castle of Kildrummy and in retaliation, the crown seized the Erskine castle at Alloa. A further protest on 4 April 1449 by sir Thomas Erskine, son of lord Robert, in the presence of the king and Parliament, stated that James had failed to fulfil the terms of the 1440 indenture and, more particularly, that the farms of the earldom for the previous term of Martinmas had been 'unjustly' detained by royal officers.[219] Although Erskine was anxious to procure a favourable decision concerning his right to the Mar estates without any further delay, the crown, confronted with the threat of a political and military clash with the Earl of Douglas and his associates, was equally eager to shelve the decision to a more favourable moment. In reply to Erksine's plea for a decision in January 1449-50 the chancellor, William, lord Crichton, on the king's behalf, quoted the Act passed by the General Council in 1445 in which all lands and lordships in which the late king had 'in peceabill possessioune' were to remain in royal hands until the majority of James II.[220] After the failure of the Douglas rebellion, the fate of the earldom of Mar was eventually decided on 14 May 1457 at the justiciary court at Aberdeen, five and a half years after the king's majority. The verdict of the inquest went against Thomas, lord Erskine, although the personal attendance of the king at the proceedings may well have forced the issue in the

---

218. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 192. Crawford, Earldom of Mar, i, 270.

219. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 199. Crawford, Earldom of Mar, i, 272-3. APS, ii, 60.

220. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 200. APS, ii, 33, 62-3.

crown's favour. The retours of 1438 were reduced since it was decided that earl Alexander had not the countess Isabell died 'last vested in the earldom' and that five of the original jurors, Skene, Buchan, Cheyne, Scroggie and Barclay were 'convinced' of their perjury at the two inquestions which illegally found lord Erskine heir to the Mar estates through countess Isabell. The king's case, resting on the unconfirmed charter of 4 August 1404 and the royal confirmation of 1426, maintained that James II, through his father, James I, was the legal heir to the earldom of Mar and Garioch following the death of earl Alexander, a bastard and lacking legal heirs.[221] Although the case, as related by lord Crawford, was coloured by later controversies, the evidence suggests not only that James II was anxious to retain the territory of Mar and Garioch in royal possession but also that Erskine's claim[222] to half the property was treated by the crown with a certain degree of high-handedness and opportunism, both during the period prior to the final decision in 1457 and also at the actual inquest. There is considerable uncertainty as to the fate of the revenues derived from the earldom of Mar between July 1438 and Michaelmas 1450.[223] Lack of surviving accounts does little to enlighten the position but there are no accounts for many areas of crown property during this period. It seems likely that when Erskine retained possession of the castle of Kildrummy he also uplifted revenues from at least part of the earldom although not from the lordship of Garioch which was in the possession of Elizabeth, countess of Buchan, until her death around 1451,[224] but with the recovery of the castle by the crown in 1448,[225]

---

221. For details concerning the inquest of 1457, see Crawford, Earldom of Mar, i, 282-301.

222. The destiny of the earldom of Mar was still at issue in the 1870s.

223. ER, vi, 54, 459.

224. RMS, ii, 592. On 20 August 1452 the lands of Garioch were granted in liferent to Mary of Guelders.

225. ER, vi, 306. £20 from the account of the custumars of Aberdeen was allowed to the temporary keepers of Kildrummy castle from the time of its redemption by the conptroller, Robert Livingstone, until the assumption to the office of keeper of Archibald Dundas.

the farms must once again have been paid to royal officers. From 1450 until the inquest of 1457 the crown not only accepted the annual profits from the estates but also alienated the lands of Muchal, part of the Mar inheritance,[226] as if the case had already been decided.

It is impossible to trace the fiscal contribution of the royal demesne for the period from 1424 to 1450 as only a few accounts have survived but between the latter date and 1454 the average annual gross farm charged to the various Ballivi ad Extra amounted to £3,270.[227] This figure was primarily derived from the Albany and Atholl inheritances coupled with the annexed estates of the earls of Mar, March and Strathearn. The £3,270 represented the gross rent and other levies due from these estates and in no way corresponded to either the actual cash handled by the local Ballivi ad Extra or the actual or real income handed over to the comptroller. Such figures are useful for comparing the theoretical value of various properties to the crown during the later Middle Ages but since they represented only the returns for which the Ballivi ad Extra was responsible and not the actual cash which passed through their hands, these figures were, in a sense, fictional. Following the territorial windfall which ensured from the Douglas forfeitures of 1455, the annual average gross return from crown property between 1457 and 1460 rose to £5,346.[228] The reign of James III witnessed a further augmentation in the landed wealth of the crown for, by 1487, the gross farm charged to local accountants amounted to £6,659.[229] Apart from the acquisition of the former

---

226. ER, v, 459, 515, 598, 652, vi, 69, 263, 359.

227. ER, vi, 448-490, 515-548, 570-603, 641-690.

228. ER, vi, 321-381, 408-487, 512-579, 603-666.

229. ER, ix, 459-537. All the accounts for the year 1487 were of one year's duration. In addition, of the royal demesne, only the farms from the island of Arran were missing and the account for the previous year was taken. It was only necessary to consider a single year at this juncture as the farm totals recorded in the accountant as charge had become fixed in quantity.

lands of the lord of the Isles, the reign of James IV did not involve any appreciable extension of property but the augmentation of rents which followed the systematic introduction of longer leases and feuing made any comparison with previous reigns impossible. Although outside the scope of this study, it would appear that a further expansion of the royal demesne occurred during the second half of the reign of James V, with the annexation of the estates of the earl of Angus, lord Glamis, sir James Colville of East Wemyss, sir James Hamiltnn of Fynnart and the confiscation of the lands of Liddesdale from the earl of Bothwell.

From 1424 the Scottish monarchy was actively engaged in the accumulation of property, the profit from which was to contribute to the expenses of government. There can be little doubt that this steady acquisition of land by successive monarchs was a deliberate attempt to augment the wealth of the crown. The royal demesne made annual provision to the cost of the king's household which encouraged the permanent retention of substantial portions of property.

D. ACTS OF ANNEXATION

It was one thing to establish a royal demesne but quite another to resist the demands of royal patronage and maintain in intact. The temporary financial crisis resulting from the necessity of paying for the ransom of David II resulted in the latter monarch issuing two statutes relating that all property and revenues 'of auld' were to remain in the possession of the crown.[230] The reference to the renewal of David II's coronation promise not to alienate royal property remained a dead letter after the fiscal emergency had receded. In 1424 James I

---

230. APS, i, 134, 168-71.

required that all the great and small customs as well as the burgh farms were to 'remane with the king till his leuing' and that inquests were to be undertaken concerning claims on any part of the above and also on lands, possessions and annual rents which had belonged to either David II, Robert II or Robert III.[231] However, in response to the large acquisition of property during the reigns of James I and II, on 4 August 1455 an Act of Parliament annexed not only customs but also certain lordships and castles 'to the crown perpetualy to remane the quhilk may not be giffyn away nother in fee nor in franktenement till ony persone of quhat estate or degree that euer he be but avyse deliuerance and decret of the haill parliament ande for gret seande and resonable cause of the Realme'. Any alienation of the annexed estates in the future were to be cancelled and 'it salbe lefull to the king beyng for the tyme to ressaif thai landis quhen euer him likis till his awne use but only process of law. Ande the takaris sall refunde all profettis that thai haif tekin up of thai landis agane to the king for all the tyme that thai hade theme.'The property named in the Act were declared annexed estates, namely the entire customs of Scotland, the lordship of Ettrick Forest, Galloway along with Threave castle, Edinburgh castle, Ballincreiff and Gosford, the royal lands within the sheriffdom of Lothian, the castle of Stirling and the royal lands within that shire, Dumbarton castle and the lands of Cardross, Rosneath and pensions from Cadzow and Kilpatrick, the earldom of Fife and the palace of Falkland, the earldom of Strathearn, the house and lordship of Brechin with the service and superiority of Cortachy, the castles of Inverness and Urquhart and 'the lordships of them', the lordship of Abernethy, the water farms of Inverness, the baronies of Urquhart, Glenmoriston, Bonach, Bonnachare, Ardmeanach, the Black Isle, Petty, Brackly, and Strathdearn, Redcastle and the lordship of Ross,[232] 'pertenying tharto'.

---

231. APS, ii, 4.

232. APS, ii, 42. ER, vi, pp cxlvii-cxlviii.

The annexation of certain estates was not to prejudice the queen's dowry. Having amassed a considerable landed patrimony it was essential that the crown attempted to permanently preserve a substantion portion of this property from future dissipation. The profit derived from these estates was destined to contribute to the cost of government but, whereas in fifteenth century England, the initiative initially sprang from the royal opposition, in Scotland, it was deliberate royal policy. The desire on the part of James I that the royal demesne should contribute to the cost of government required the existance of a substantial block of property which was to remain permanently with the crown. Much of the property which James I acquired during his reign was not only still in royal hands in 1437 but continued to belong to the crown as late as 1513. This policy was followed by his successors. However, until 1455, there was no written confirmation of this policy but that Acts of Annexation of 1455 and 1469, which coincided with the Douglas and Boyd forfeitures respectively, provided official sanction of a policy initiated by James I. The Act of Annexation listed a series of estates, either newly forfeited or already established in royal possession, which were to form the basis of the royal demesne whose inalienability was now officially set down in the Parliamentary records. The fact that not all the property in crown hands in 1455 and 1469 were declared annexed estates, that is property permanently reserved for its fiscal contribution to the expenses of government, suggests that the crown still regarded land as a source of patronage. The remaining items of the royal demesne were declared 'unannexed' property and were not subject to the same restrictions of alienation. In 1469, following the forfeiture of the Boyds, further estates were annexed to the Principality. This Act of Annexation listed the lands of the lordship of Bute and Rothesay castle, Arran, the lordship of Cowal, and the castle of Dunoon, the earldom of Carrick, the lands of Dundonald with the castle, the barony of Renfrew, the lordships of Stewarton, and Kilmarnock along with the castle, Dalry, Noddisdale, Kilbride, Nairstone

and Caverton, along with Terrenzean, Drumcoll and Trabboch. In addition the lands of Tealing and an annual rent from Brechin, formerly in the possession of Thomas Boyd, earl of Arran, was annexed to the crown.[233] As there was no prince of full age until Charles I, the annexation of lands of the Principality had no effect on the accounts of Ballivi ad Extra. On 17 February 1471-2 the earldom of Orkney and the lordship of Shetland 'were annext and uniit to the crovne nocht to be gevin away in tyme tocum to na persone nor personis except annerly til ane of the kingis sonis of lauchfull bed'.[234]

It is significant that most of the lands listed in the above annexations remained in royal possession until at least 1513. To be valid a grant out of the annexed property must be made by the monarch during his majority and with the full sanction of Parliament. Thus, the only legal concessions from annexed estates could be made 'by dissolution' following the consent of Parliament. On 11 August 1503, during the majority of James IV, James, lord Hamilton, now created earl of Arran, was granted the lands of Arran in fee and heritage and the king promised to ratify the gift at the next Parliament and, if necessary, granting a new charter recording the dissolution of the previous annexation of the lands to the crown.[235] However, on 7 August 1484, 20 marks of the lands of Caverton, formerly held by the crown following the forfeiture of Robert, lord Boyd, were granted in heritage to Walter Ker of Cessford with no hint of Parliamentary sanction.[236] Although normally the legal formalities were observed, namely the majority of the king and Parliamentary consent, the power of the latter seems to have been merely to act as a rubber stamp since ratification

---

233. APS, ii, 186-7.

234. APS, ii, 102.

235. RMS, ii, 2741.

236. RMS, ii, 1593.

by the three estates was arranged after the actual grant had been made. On 29 December 1491 Archibald, earl of Angus was granted a lifetime concession of the lordship of Kilmarnock and the castle in exchange for the lands of Liddesdale and the castle of Hermitage but the earl informed the king that the lands had been annexed to the Principality by James III and he was anxious that the lands would be reclaimed by a future prince. In response, the king promised to guarantee earl Archibald the lands and when the king had attained his majority the grant would be confirmed to Archibald in Parliament.[237] This settlement in fact never materialised since earl Archibald quickly secured a further exchange of property whereby he secured the lordship of Bothwell, 'unannexed' lands, for the lands of Kilmarnock.[238] When Margaret Tudor received a liferent to the lordship of Kilmarnock on 13 March 1503~~04~~, the gift was ratified in Parliament at Edinburgh.[239] Although the crown did not indulge in a wholesale dissipation of the annexed estates, when it was necessary to grant out a specific portion of this type of royal property, even during a royal minority, there were few barriers to prevent such an action. As in the case of the 1491 grant of the lordship of Kilmarnock, it was merely a matter of obtaining Parliamentary sanction at the appropriate moment. Hereditary and liferent concessions within annexed royal lordships and baronies tended to proceed with little regard to the conditions attached to such estates, for instance, on 30 April 1507 certain lands within the lordships of Galloway and Ballincreiff were gifted in heritage to John Lindsay, formerly of Wauchop with no reference to Parliamentary sanction.[240]

Conversely, the crown was not reluctant to employ the excuse of annexed

---

237. RMS, ii, 2073.

238. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 127-134. The second exchange undertaken by Angus may well have resulted from his anxiety over the insecurity of his possession of the lordship of Kilmarnock, a gift which the crown was legally entitled to revoke at any point.

239. APS, ii, 271. RMS, ii, 2772.

240. RMS, ii, 3095. ER, xiii, 36, 83. John Lindsay was forfeited by Parliament in February 1505-6 but seems to have been quickly rehabilitated.

property in order to reclaim portions of royal demesne which had been granted at some previous date. After the battle of Sauchieburn in 1488 the two Acts of Annexation of 1455 and 1469 were quoted in order to deprive two of the principal props of James III's government of gifts conferred on them by the late king. On 20 January 1488-9 John, lord Carlyle was divested of his grant of the lands of Drumcoll, bestowed on him in fee and heritage by James III 'be gift charter and confirmation in Parliament' by the Lords Auditors. The royal right of reclamation hinged on the clause 'that it sall be lefull ay and ony tyme to thaim (the king and prince of Scotland) to tak the said landis in ther handis at ther will as wes schewin be the annexatioun of the samyn landis of Drumcoll' and the lands in question returned to the royal demesne.[241] Similarly, two days later, James IV again employed the Act of Annexation to deprive David, earl of Crawford of the lands of Brechin and Navar and 'ane terme assigned to proove against him, the availl of the mailles and dewties of the saidis landis with the pertinentis, intrometted with be him, sen the time of the gift theirof'.[242] The terms of the Acts of Annexation were suitably wide to enable the crown to utilise it to the best advantage.

E. EFFECT OF PATRONAGE ON THE ROYAL DEMESNE

Although the financial contribution of the royal demesne to the various expenses of royal government was the prime consideration from 1424, the demands of royal patronage on this source of crown revenue was still in evidence. This was, to a certain extent, unavoidable for the need to reward faithful

---

241. ADA, 121. RMS, ii, 1327, 1385.

242. ADA, 123. RMS, ii, 1111. In addition, reduction of this gift was also demanded because of the later concession of the lands to James, duke of Ross. RMS, ii, 1470.

servants and political allies was an everpresent drain on royal revenue, but fifteenth century Scottish monarchs, in common with their English counterparts from Edward IV, were anxious to avoid the prevalence of excessive largess which had existed in both countries in the fourteenth century.

The endowment of royal younger sons in Mediaeval Europe frequently resulted in the creation of territorial appanages and the consequential alienation of large blocks of royal property. However, contemporary opinion was reconciled to the tenet that one of the principal functions of the royal estate was to ensure adequate endowment for all members of the royal family. Numerous offsprings tended to reduce the income derived from the royal demesne but the Mediaeval monarch was bound and encouraged to make sufficient provision for his wife, heir, younger sons and even his illegitimate children. From time to time this policy led to the creation of well endowed and politically powerful magnates, whose wealth and proximity to the throne resulted in an extremely tense situation. The numerous progeny of Edward III in England and Robert II north of the border adequately revealed the effects of such luxuries. However, although such eventualities caused a considerable diversification of crown estates to various members of the royal family, accidents of politics and the failure of lines often returned lands to the king's possession. Despite the dissipation of royal property to the six sons of Robert II, who, far from adding to the strength of the king, were disruptive and dangerous individuals, but, by the accession of James II, this loss of territory had been recovered. The eldest son John had succeeded to the throne as Robert III, David, earl of Strathearn, Walter, earl of Fife, and Alexander, earl of Buchan had died childless, while the political careers of Robert, duke of Albany and Walter, earl of Atholl ended in the subsequent forfeiture of their line. Although the power of Albany and Atholl did not outlive or gain in momentum following their deaths, during their respective periods of hegemony their territorial wealth and political influence proved extremely dangerous to the

crown.

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries few younger sons survived to gain affective possession of the property granted to them. Not long after birth, the king's sons were granted specific estates but until their majority, the revenues from these lands were still paid over to royal officials. For instances, John, the third son of James III, born about 1479, received a grant of the earldom of Mar and Garioch on 2nd March 1485-6,[243] but the profits from the estates continued to be accounted at the Exchequer until 1 May 1498 when earl John entered into his inheritance[244] but from 11 March 1502-3 the lands and accounts were once again recorded at the annual Exchequer audit since the property had returned to the crown on the death of John.[245] However few such concessions actually resulted in loss of revenue to the crown as most of the royal children during the late Mediaeval period in Scotland died in infancy.[246] Those royal children who did survive infancy and gained effective possession of their property mostly died childless and frequently in violent circumstances. David, duke of Rothesay, the eldest son of Robert, died mysteriously at Falkland palace in 1402, of the three surviving sons of James II, Alexander, duke of Albany forfeited his estates in March and Mar in 1483 after presistance association with England[247] while his brother, John, earl of Mar, was undoubtedly violently removed by James III four years previous. Although no legitimate royal issues succeeded in establishing lines certain natural sons fared better. To John Stewart, the 'frater carnalis' of James II, the earldom of Atholl and the lands of Balvany, Bothruthin, and Bocharn were gifted[248] while James Stewart

---

243. RMS, ii, 1642.

244. ER, xi, 156.

245. ER, xii, 129, 296.

246. For details of royal offsprings, see Paul, The Scots Peerage, i, 17-22.

247. APS, ii, 147-152.

248. RMS, ii, 750, 1503. John was styled earl of Atholl in the 1460 charter.

the son of sir James Stewart of Lorne and queen Joan, the widow of James I, received the earldom of Buchan and other lands in Aberdeenshire.[249] Both these persons were able to pass their inheritances to their offspring. James Stewart, the illegitimate son of James IV and Janet Kennedy, was, on 12 June 1501, endowed with the earldom of Moray but the crown retained the profits from the earldom during his minority.[250] Although James Stewart was not entitled to the profits of the earldom of Moray until the attainment of his majority, on 1 June 1501, his mother, Janet Kennedy, was assigned the farms of considerable royal property within the earldom, amounting to an annual loss of £120, for the duration of her life and she also seems to have retained the demesne of Darnaway, Constablefield, Colnakevill and Sloypule, at an annual farm of £23-6-8, in her possession.[251] In addition, the forest of Buchan, the lands of Kitsdale, Arborg and others within the lordship of Galloway, valued at £36 annually, were also granted to the same lady.[252] Although female relatives of the king were not normally bestowed with royal property, since they were usually sustained by their future spouse, on 14 October 1482, Mary, lady Hamilton, the sister of James III, was granted the baronies of Kilmarnock, Dalry, Kilbride, the lands of Noddisdale, Munford, Rivisdalemure, Railstone, Flat and property within the lordship of Stewarton, the lands of Tealing, Polgavy, Nariston and Caverton, in liferent, which probably represented her terce as the widow of Thomas Boyd, earl of Arran.[253]

Included in royal marriage contracts was the provision of the future queen's jointure, calculated at approximately a third of the total royal income.

---

249. RMS, ii, 1314. This charter represented a regrant of an earlier concession not recorded in the Register of the Great Seal.

250. RMS, ii, 2586.

251. RMS, ii, 2585. ER, xii, 53, 222, 287.

252. ER, xii, 15, 253, 461.

253. RMS, ii, 1519, 1520.

On 1 July 1451 Mary of Guelders was granted liferent possession of a large proportion of the landed property of the Scottish crown, the customs and burgh farms from Cupar, Perth and Stirling, £100 annual pension from the customs or farms of the burgh of Aberdeen, castles and palaces at Methven, Faulkland, Doune, Linlithgow and Stirling with their surrounding lochs, fishing, parks and gardens and the power to appoint the sheriffs of Fife, Stirling and Linlithgow.[254] The value of the concession was quoted at £5,000 Scots. The actual property quoted in the jointure settlement with Mary of Guelders and those included in the charters granted to Margaret of Denmark on 11 October 1473 and to Margaret Tudor on 24 May 1503 tended not to vary to any great extent, concentrating mostly on crown holdings in the central and southern areas of the country and seldom admitting estates situated north of the river Tay.[255] Although the jointure for Margaret Tudor was valued at £6,000 Scots (or £2,000 sterling), the amount of landed property quoted in the charter was in fact less than that included in the settlement arranged for Mary of Guelders, undoubtedly the result of the raising of lease farms and the introduction of feuing. During the life-time of the king the profit from the jointure lands and burghs was still collected by the king's Ballivi ad Extra, custumars and burgh baillies and the net income was paid to the comptroller who was responsible for the provisioning of both households. In the 1509 account of sir Duncan Forrester, for instance, receipts were made from the jointure lands of Menteith, Stirlingshire, Methven, Ettrick Forest, March and Linlithgowshire and disbursements were made by the same official for the provisioning of the queen's household and stables and the payment of the fees of a number of her household servants.[256] The accounts relating to the queen's holdings during the lifetime of the king were little

---

254. RMS, ii, 462. On 22 January 1449-50 Mary was confirmed the grant of certain lands whose returns arrived at the value of 10,000 French crowns as promised in the marriage contract. APS, ii, 61. RMS, ii, 306.

255. RMS, ii, 1143, 2721. APS, ii, 188.

256. ER, xiii, 249-260.

affected by the alteration of ownership, payments and administration were still at the dictates of the king with only token recognition of the queen's position. On 1 June 1452 James II granted Robert Nory a hereditary grant of the lands of the Ward of Gudy within the earldom of Menteith 'with the consent and assent of his consort Mary queen of Scotland'.[257]

In addition, it was not uncommon for the queen, even during the reign of her husband, to be granted certain estates outwith her jointure and which did not fall under the supervision of the Ballivi ad Extra. Mary of Guelders, a powerful figure during the political unrest of the reign of James II benefitted considerably from the king's generosity. In 1451 the lands of Calendar and Kilsyth, forfeited by sir Alexander Livingstone along with the lordship of Kinclaven in 1449, were gifted to Mary, in 1452 she was in receipt of the lands of Halton, forfeited by William Lauder of Halton. In the same year the earldom of Garioch fell to the queen following the death of the countess of Buchan and the queen also gained possession of the lands of Manuel in Stirlingshire, half of Kirkandrews and Puncton in Galloway, Dysart in Fife and the estates of the late George Douglas of Leswalt.[258] On 25 June 1470 Margaret of Denmark, the wife of James III, was granted the lands of Kilmarnock, Railston, Kilbride and others within the shires of Ayr and Lanark which had recently been forfeited by Robert, lord Boyd.[259] Margaret Tudor received an annual pension of £1,000 from the treasurer distinct from her jointure settlement.[260] In common with the jointure lands, these gifts were to endure for the lifetime of the queen but

---

257. ER, v, 595. RMS, ii, 566.

258. RMS, ii, 508, 544, 592, 693, 694, 746, 762. The lands forfeited by sir Alexander Livingstone were restored to James, lord Livingstone by April 1458. RMS, ii, 606.

259. RMS, ii, 992.

260. ER, vii, 47-106, 161-200. Although these accounts concentrated on the jointure estates, the lands of Manuel, conceded to the queen in 1459, were included in the account of sir Robert Mure, chamberlain of the queen's lands within the shire of Linlithgow. ER. vii, 48.

the profits from these estates were submitted entirely to the queen as shown by the fact that no accounts have survived in the Exchequer Rolls for these estates.

However, on the death of the king, the jointure lands were then separated from the other royal estates in the accounts and the income was transferred to the queen's own fiscal officials. For three years after the death of James II in 1460 the queen's chamberlains and receivers accounted at special audits for the revenue from these estates and the real revenue was paid over to her central officials, Margaret Balfour,and Henry Kinghorn, the queen's steward, for her own personal use and expenditure.[261] On Mary's death in December 1463, the terce lands reverted back to the crown and once again came under the supervision of royal Ballivi ad Extra. This arrangement would presumably have operated on the death of James III had his queen not died before him while after 1513 the jointure estates ceased to be recorded in the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra as the income was submitted to the dowager. However, after the death of James I in 1437, his widow, Joan Beaufort, received the entire customs returns from Linlithgow, an annual annuity of £100 from the customs and burgh farms of Aberdeen as part of her endowment, along with several additional payments.[262]

Even after this revolution in the attitude of the crown towards royal property in which the pressures of patronage were subordinated to the fiscal requirements of the king's household, the former was still very much evident even in the fifteenth century. During the fourteenth century, it was accepted practice to regrant almost all the estates which devolved on the crown through

---

261. ER, v, 16, 20, 24, 30, 56, 70-1, 92, 117, 123, 133, 154, 184, 187, 199. The shortage of landed accounts during the minority of James II makes it impossible to discover the property settlement arranged for Joan.

262. TA, ii, 243, iii, 37, 46, 268, 271, 416, iv, 28, 29, 217. Even after her marriage to the Black Knight of Lorne in 1439, her pensions from Aberdeen were paid until her death in 1445. ER, v, 187.

forfeiture or the failure of succession but, after 1424, there was a determined attempt on the part of the crown to retain many of these estates in its possession and employ the profits accruing from the properties to assist the costs of government. However, despite this alteration of policy, patronage, in the shape of reward for royal services and as a means of attracting and maintaining the loyalty of important political personalities, still held an important position.

Although, in the fifteenth century, forfeited estates were no longer totally dispersed in the interests of patronage almost as soon as they had fallen to the crown, it was common policy on the part of the crown to split the newly acquired property in the interests of finance and patronage. The principal benefactors from the forfeiture of the Livingstones and James Dundas in 1449 were William, earl of Douglas, Alexander Napier, the comptroller, who received the lands of Philde, Stephen Scott, Mary of Guelders and others who were gifted small portions of property.[263] The evidence appears to suggest that the new queen combined with the earl of Douglas, the principal benefactors from the forfeiture of the Livingstones, to secure the downfall of the family which had held the young James II under its control for several years. Although the majority of Douglas estates were permanently annexed to the crown in 1455, the lands of Eskdale were granted by James II to George, earl of Angus on 28 January 1458-9 while other former Douglas territorial holdings tended to be broken up among smaller landholders.[264] On 16 January 1463-4 the lands of Sutherlandhall, forfeited by William Cockburn in Parliament for treasonable assistance given to James, earl of Douglas, and the lands of Cranstone in the shire of Edinburgh along with Traquair and Lethanehope in Peebles-shire, forfeited by William Murray for the same reasons, were quickly regranted to William Douglas of Cluny.[265] After the battle of Sauchieburn, the former lands of

---

263. RMS, ii, 316, 317, 321, 324, 353, 357, 374, 395, 465, 508.

264. RMS, ii, 670.

265. RMS, ii, 775.

William, lord Crichton, namely the lordship of Crichton and the baronies of Kirkmichael and Drivesdale, forfeited by Parliament in 1484, were conceded to Patrick, lord Hailes along with the lordship of Bothwell which had recently been forfeited by John Ramsey, the former lord Bothwell.[266]

To gain and then preserve the loyalty of politically active barons and royal servants patronage was a vital factor. A tight fisted king frequently failed to attract supporters. The excessive largess of the fourteenth century was occasioned by the weakness of a monarchy compelled to resort to the distribution of lavish favours in order to preserve its unstable position. The resurgance of the crown from the reign of James I attempted to resist the pressures of excessive liberality in an effort to build up the financial and territorial wealth of the monarchy. Yet James I and his successors were not oblivious to the need for a limited degree of patronage and, in Scotland, the fifteenth and early sixteenth century represented an era when the crown attempted to reconcile the two positions, trying to avoid the Scylla of unswerving rapacity and the Charybdis of uncontrolable liberality.

As seen above, the redistribution of a portion of forfeited estates to royal supporters was one of the principal means of attracting their continued support. However, in addition, it was periodically necessary to alienate sections of the royal demesne in the interests of patronage. This trend assumed a variety of forms.

Firstly, at times of political crisis, it was frequently necessary to alienate substantial portions of royal property in order to drum up sufficient support to ride the storm and also to finance the military activities of royal adherents. A prime example occurred during the rebellion of the earl of Douglas in the early 1450s. Political crises often proved expensive events for the crown. A loan of 800 marks was received from the offerings made in

---

266. APS, ii, 154-164, 201-6. RMS, ii, 1784.

Glasgow Cathedral and for repayment, the bishop was assigned the farms and other returns from the royal property of Bute, Arran and Cowal along with the customs returns from the burghs of Ayr, Irvine and Dumbarton, to the value of £100 annually until the full amount was redeemed.[267] From the date of the concession until his death in 1454 the bishop of Glasgow received several payments of cash, barley and marts from these estates, including an annual allowance for keeping the castle of Dunoon.[268] The charter also granted the bishop freedom to lease the property, raise the farms, hold courts and distrain transgressors for a period of ten years but his attempts at leasing the island of Arran to McAlister resulted in a three year loss of farms, totalling £170-16s.[269] On the bishop's death in 1454, the king took the opportunity to halt these various allowances after only two and a half years. During the temporary royal occupation of the lordship of Stewarton in the early 1450s, portions of the property were gifted to attract the loyalty of powerful families situated within the Douglas sphere of influence; the lands of Langshaws, Castletown and others, valued at £27-13-4 annually, were granted to sir Alexander Hume while those of Bagraw, Foulwood and others with an annual farm of £26-13-4 were conceded to Gilbert Kennedy of Dunmure, both gifts were in heritage and were recorded in later royal accounts of Stewarton.[270] Crown supporters in the north benefitted from opposing Douglasses' allies in that region. Apart from the concession of the lordship of Badenoch in 1451,[271] between 1450 and 1455 Alexander

---

267. RMS, ii, 542. Concerning the revenue from these sources in excess of the annual allowance of £100, the bishop was to account to the king in the Exchequer.

268. ER, v, 452-4, 456, 573-8, 664-7, vi, 98.

269. ER, v, 664-5, vi, 45, 47, 231, 328. Efforts were made to distrain the lands and goods of McAlister by the sheriff of Bute but the cash never seems to have been recovered. ER, vi, 329, 418, 532, 629, vii, 272.

270. RMS, ii, 485, 583. ER, vi, 340-1.

271. RMS, ii, 442.

earl of Huntly occupied the lands of Aberyeldy,[272] Kynnynmont and Bochrum,[273] the ward of the lands of Meldrum,[274] valued at 100 marks annually, retained custody of Kildrummy castle with an annual fee of £100 from the farms of the earldom of Mar and a further £20 from the rents of the demesne lands of Kildrummy and Migvy[275] and seized customary marts and oats due from the husbandmen of the earldom of the crown.[276] No attempt was made by the crown to alienate the earl of Huntly by demanding the repayment of lost revenue from the earldom of Mar and, included in the general remission granted by James II to the earl for the devastation of the earldom of Mar, was £143-13-6 of royal farms seized by Huntly in 1452 and 1453, which sum was finally allowed to master Richard Forbes, chamberlain of Mar.[277] The earl of Orkney was rewarded with a grant of the earldom of Caithness in 1455 on the resignation of George Crichton of Carnis who had received specific property within the earldom and also the title in 1452 and who had subsequently been prevailed upon to surrender the gift back to James II who had possibly regretted his earlier rashness.[278] In May 1454 George Crichton surrendered all his acquisitions to the crown, including the lands within the earldom of Caithness, Wra and Strathbrock in the Lothians, but, having captured the castle of Blackness 'in contrar of the king', the latter was obliged to concede the lands of Strathurd as compensation to the disinherited James Crichton, son of the 'beltit erle or Caitnes'.[279] In addition, the queen was well endowed

---

272. ER, v, 367, 652, vi, 67-8.

273. ER, v, 367, 655, vi, 68.

274. ER, v, 655, vi, 69.

275. ER, vi, 518, 600, vi, 70.

276. ER, v, 518, 525, vi, 71.

277. The Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 203. ER, vi, 266.

278. RMS, ii, 549, 587.

279. Auchinlek Chronicle, 13, 54-5.

with royal property during the crises years.

In May 1488 James III was prepared to distribute various portions of the royal demesne to persons willing to side with him in battle against the rebel army led by his son, prince James. Thomas Turnbull of Greenwood was gifted the lands of Terrenzeane in Ayrshire for his assistance and aid at Blackness, David, earl of Crawford was in receipt of a hereditary grant of the lands of the lordship of Kinclaven, at a gross annual farm of £72, James Dunbar of Cumnock received the feu of certain lands within the earldum of Moray, and James Innes was granted £20 worth of estates also in Moray, with the proviso that these grantees continued to serve the king during the period of the present discord.[280] However, with the defeat of James III at Sauchieburn, most of these concessions were nullified, except the gift to Crawford, who retained possession of the lordship of Kinclaven until his death at Christmas 1495.[281]

Secondly, in addition to gifts and grants from royal property, forced on the crown at times of political unrest, royal patronage was also employed as a means of moulding and preserving a royal 'party', with the object of lending political and administrative support to the king. These loyalists were presented with material rewards and inducements from a variety of sources, of which the royal demesne was only one. As mentioned above, James II was prepared to grant concessions from, and remissions for the arbitrary seizures of, crown income and territorial possession in order to attract a royalist 'party' as a political and military counter to the threat of the earl of Douglas and his allies. In addition, royal supporters were not only induced by material concessions but also by the numerous peerage elevations conferred by James II during the 1450s.

However, it was during the reign of James III that the crown made a

---

280. RMS, ii, 1724, 1725, 1727, 1730.

281. ER, x, 252, 254, 324, 521, 577. RMS, ii, 1895.

determinedeffort to construct a royal 'party' of both influencial magnates and ecclesiastic and also of professional men, whose administrative ability and experience was necessary to maintain the efficient working of the government machinery. Both the king's councillors and his administrative advisors tended to originate from the upper eschelons of society and, in many cases, were not 'new men' in the reign of James III, but, in fact, well tried men, whose careers often stretched back to the reign of James II. Although the 'myth' of James III, as perpetuated by various chroniclers, the victors of the battle of Sauchieburn, and indeed, even by many modern historians, stated that James entertained the company and advice of 'low born favourites' to the exclusion of his natural advisors, the evidence from the financial and civil records for the period revealed that it was men like Colin, earl of Argyll, David, earl of Crawford, Andrew, lord Avondale, John, lord Carlyle, sir James Shaw of Sauchie, and other persons of that ilk and not Thomas Cochran, William Torphichen nor James Hommyl, who attended Parliament, appeared on the 'sederents' of judicial courts, acted as fiscal auditors or were in receipt of royal patronage.[282] Generally, it was the former who also received the maximum benefit from royal patronage. During the final twenty years of the reign of James III, Colin, earl of Argyll was a prominant figure in government circles, he acted as chancellor between 1483 and 27 February 1487-8,[283] master of the king's household from 1471 to at least 1481,[284] a frequent auditor of fiscal accounts,[285] and a common member of commissions leasing royal property.[286] However, he also

---

282. For evidence of Parliamentary and Judicial 'sederunts', see Acts of Parliaments of Scotland, Acts of the lords Auditors, Acts of the lords of the Council in Civil Causes, for lists of financial auditors, see Exchequer Rolls and Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer.

283. ER, ix, 232, 298, 437, 459.

284. ER, viii, 1, 139, 266, 326. RMS, ii, 1044, 1464.

285. ER, viii, 1, 139, 266, 326, ix, 232, 298, 437, 459. TA, i, 1.

286. ER, xi, 419, 585, 603, 612-4, 620-1, 631, 636, 639, 641, 648, 650.

benefitted considerably from grants from royal property; on 18 January 1472-3 the earl was appointed keeper of Dunoon castle with the Broadlands, at an annual farm of £18, as payment of his fee,[287] on 26 February 1480-1 the earl received a gift of 160 marks of land within the lordship of Knapdale, part of the estate resigned to the crown by the lord of the Isles on his rehabilitation in 1476[288] and on 29 April 1483 the lands of Pinkerton in the earldom of March were granted in heritage to Argyll following the forfeiture of the duke of Albany.[289] In addition, Argyll drew £20 and £40 annual fee from the farms of Balquidder[290] in Menteith and Houston, West Mains, Strathbrock and Kirkhill within the shire of Linlithgow respectively,[291] coupled with a further £20 annual allowance from the rents of the lands of Glenable in Menteith.[292] David, earl of Crawford, despite his father's hostility to James II during the Douglas crisis, was one of the staunchest adherents of James III, whose trust in the earl was reflected in his appointments to the office of keeper of Berwick castle in 1473[293] and great chamberlain from 1483.[294] Earl David also benefitted territorially from his loyalty to James III, on 9 March 1472-3 he received a heritable grant of the lordship of Brechin and Navar,[295] and, although John Dempster of Auchterless, the royal chamberlain of the lordship of Brechin, continued to account at the Exchequer until 1482, the accounts made it clear that Crawford had already been

---

287. ER, viii, 508, 616, ix, 25, 109, 613. RMS, ii, 1100.

288. RMS, ii, 1246, 1464. APS, ii, 189.

289. RMS, ii, 1564. ER, ix, 521.

290. ER, viii, 567, ix, 114, 240, 331, 411, 493, 566, 592.

291. ER, viii, 63, 152, 212, 304, 333, 403, 511, 603, ix, 105, 243, 400, 640.

292. ER, viii, 70, 173, 234, 349, 423, 533.

293. RMS, ii, 1133. ER, viii, 251, ix, 433. Although the original letter of gift quoted a three year tenure the concession was extended until the castle was lost to the English in the early 1480s.

294. Handbook of British Chronology, 179.

295. RMS, ii, 1111.

active in diverting a substantial proportion of the revenue from these estates,[296] in 1484 the lands of Todrik and Cockburn in March were granted to Crawford following Albany's forfeiture[297] and finally in 1488 the entire lordship of Kinclaven was gifted to Crawford.[298] On # May 1471 Andrew, lord Avondale, chancellor until 1482, was in receipt of a liferent grant of the earldom of Lennox, a concession which revealed a complete disregard, on the part of James III, of both the rights of the heirs to the earldom and of the fact that the estates were only in non-entry and could not be arbitrarily distributed as if they were royal property.[299] Although, on 27 July 1473, an instrument of sasine was issued in favour of John, lord Darnley as heir to Duncan, earl of Lennox in the title and half the lands of the earldom of Lennox, in the previous month, a royal letter under the privy seal promised to restore the lands of Darnley, Torbolton, Dregane, Galston and Bathgate on condition that lord Darnley admitted the liferent grant of lord Avandale.[300] In addition to the appointment as keeper of Stirling castle, lord Avandale was also conceded the lands of the Offerens of Shiregartane in Menteith from 1472.[301] Other members of the king's 'party' also benefitted territorially, John, lord Darnley was appointed keeper of Rothesay castle in 1465 with an allowance of 40 marks from the unassigned revenue of the lordship of Bute for his fee and two years late, in a royal letter under the privy seal, John was assigned a fee of 100 marks from the same lordship, of which £40 was allocated in cash from royal property and the remaining 40 marks to be paid 'in ber and martis of Bute.[302] John, lord Carlyle received a

---

296. ER, viii, 441, 484, 618-9, ix, 56-7, 132-3, 173.

297. RMS, ii, 1599, ER, ix, 519.

298. RMS, ii, 1725.

299. RMS, ii, 1018.

300. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 44-6, 97-100.

301. ER, viii, 172, 233, 273, 349, 423, 534, 566, ix, 39, 114, 190, 240, 331, 411, 493.

302. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 78-80, 84-5, 123. ER, viii, 162, 451, 527, 617, ix, 27, 352-3, 487-9.

hereditary grant of the lands of Drumcoll in Dumfries in 1477, principally for his labours in France[303] while, in the same year, John Ross of Montgrenane acquired a life grant of the lands of Potterton, Blacklaw, Nether Robertland and half Cuttiswra within the lordship of Stewarton.[304] Thus, the majority of the influencial members of the royal 'party' were recipients of royal patronage and it was vital that the king maintained this flow of favours in order to preserve the loyalty of his adherents.

Although chroniclers, both Mediaeval and modern, have successfully perpetuated the myth of James III's 'favourites' it is extremely doubtful if James sought the advice and guidance of persons like William Torphichen, the fencing master, William Roger, the musician or Leonard, the shoemaker and, if they existed in the first place, they were probably only menial household employees. It is clear from the destiny of royal patronage, that James III relied on men of influence and ability not dilettantes. Few 'favourites' seems to have benefitted from royal favour. Of those who appear in the fiscal records, James Hommyl, the king's tailor, had been in receipt of a life fee of £20 from the farms of the lordship of Stirlingshire in respect of his trade since 1473, which, although a fairly large fee in the mid fifteenth century for a member of the royal household, was the sole record of royal patronage to this 'favourite' who survived the haulocost at Lauder Bridge and was forced to flee the kingdom after Sauchieburn.[305] Concerning Robert Cochran, a mason, there is no record and it would appear unlikely that he ever received possession of the earldom of Mar for such wanton alienation of the royal demesne would have been untypical of

---

303. RMS, ii, 1327, 1385.

304. RMS, ii, 1825. ER, xiii, 486, ix, 37, 131, 164, 259, 413.

305. ER, viii, 160, 244, 280, 328, 429, 504, 562, ix, 93, 170, 249, 326, 425, 483, x, 3. He was also a tenant of the lands of Skeoch in Stirlingshire during the 1480s. ER, ix, 568, 600, 634. During the reign of James IV his son, James, was reaccepted into court circles, also as a tailor. TA, ii, 208, 212-5, 221, 313, 390.

James III.[306]

However, of the king's immediate circle, only two men could be termed 'new'. One was William Schevez, a doctor, who was subsequently raised to the see of St. Andrews. The other was John Ramsey, the only one of the 'favourites' to escape the Lauder Bridge incident, who seems to have begun his career in royal service as a squire of the king's chamber.[307] However, he benefitted considerably from the patronage of James III; on 20 May 1483 Ramsey and his wife received a life grant of the mill of Strathmiglo in Fife,[308] at the same time they were in receipt of a 19 year lease of the lands of Two Kinkellis in Strathearn, at an annual farm which was £8 a year smaller than the previous lease,[309] and in February 1483-4 he was granted the lordship of Bothwell along with an additional 40 marks of land within the lordship which William, lord Moneypenny had lost through the operation of the royal revolution.[310] From his career it would seem that Ramsey was more than a mere 'court pimp',[311] for his rise to fortune under James III and again under James IV after his rehabilitation following his forfeiture in 1488 suggests that he must have possessed a powerful character, considerable personal appeal and a dynamic business mind.

---

306. There is no conclusive evidence, except in chronicles, that Cochran ever received either the title or the lands of Mar, although the accounts for the earldom do not reappear in the Exchequer Rolls following the death of the earl of Mar, the king's brother in 1479. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, i, 168-70. Lesley, History of Scotland, 48.

307. RMS, ii, 1565.

308. ER, ix, 236, 372, 510.

309. ER, ix, 255, 329, 356.

310. APS, ii, 153. The accounts of the receiver of Bothwell were terminated in July 1481. ER, ix, 127.

311. Mackie, King James IV of Scotland, 15. Although John Ramsey's family was of lairdly stock he himself was probably a younger son or a more distant relative of the main branch. He married Isabel Cant, a surname normally associated with burgess families.

Despite the political revolution of 1488 only a few portions of land changed hands and the royal demesne was hardly affected. However, during the reign of James IV certain favoured persons reaped the benefits of crown patronage. On 11 August 1503 James, lord Hamilton, on account of his close relationship to the crown and in recompense for labours and services at the time of the king's wedding, received a hereditary grant of the entire island of Arran and the title of earl.[312] At such a moment as a royal wedding, it was custumary that the king should act with suitable generosity, a mood which also benefitted John Forman who was in receipt of a hereditary gift of lands in the earldom of Mar.[313] In December 1507, Alexander Elphinstone, son of John Elphinstone of that ilk and relative of William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen and keeper of the privy seal, was the recipient of a hereditary grant of the lands of Invernochty and others within the lordship of Strathdon and also other estates within the vicinity of Skalater in the same lordship, acquired through an exchange with property in the lordship of Garioch. The entire concession, with an annual farm of £96-13-4, was united into the barony of Invernochty.[314] On 14 January 1509-10 Elphinstone was conceded the demesne lands of Kildrummy, Clova and others within the region of the castle, also incorporated in the gift, in fee and heritage. These lands had previously been held in feufarm by Alexander and on the occasion of his erection to a lord of Parliament at the baptism of prince Arthur, the estates were annexed to his barony of Invernochty.[315] James IV seems to have held the Elphinstone family in extremely high esteem, undoubtedly through the dedicated service of William Elphinstone to the crown

---

312. RMS, ii, 2741.

313. RMS, ii, 2745.

314. ER, xiii, 69-70, 198, 206.

315. ER, xiii, 300-3. Both grants included his wife, Elizabeth Barclay as a joint infeftment.

during the reign, for the head of the family was, in two stages, granted the entire lordship of Strathdon which had contributed a gross annual farm of £187-6-8, 15 marts and 1 chalder, 15 bolls of oats to royal revenue.[316] Royal officers, especially those engaged in financial administration, were not infrequently gifted portions of the crown demesne, probably as a method of repaying a royal debt. On 8 March 1501-2 John Stirling of Craigbernard, the comptroller, was in receipt of a life concession of the lands of Arnebeg, Shire-gartane, Kip and other estates within the earldom of Menteith, which lands contributed an annual farm of £22-13-4.[317]

Although many of these gifts and concessions were substantial in value and although they had the cumulative effect of detracting from the gross income of the crown, because royal patronage was now confined within certain limits, the situation was never permitted to snowball out of hand, as had occurred in the fourteenth century.

Apart from the actual concession of a portion of property, royal revenue was also affected by a proliferation of fees and assorted pensions which were derived from the profit of the royal demesne. The concession of an estate involved not only the alienation of the farms and grassums,which were normally collected on the crown's behalf by the Ballivi ad Extra but also various other rights to which the grantee was now entitled. For instance, the charter of concession of part of the lordship of Strathdon to Alexander Elphinstone in 1507 provided a list of many of these rights, 'including the forests, woods, groves, 'le schawis and glennys', meadows, pools, pasture, mills, multures,

---

316. ER, xiii, 67. Alexander Elphinstone also received in these charters the custody of Kildrummy castle, one of the principal strongholds in the north of Scotland and the patronage of the abbey of Deer. In addition, at this period, he was keeper of Stirling castle and chamberlain of the king's property within that shire. ER, xiii, 24-5, 162, 270-1. Further, Elphinstone retained the lease of several royal estates within Stirlingshire.

317. ER, xii, 25-6.

brewaries, smiths, lime, stone, fishing, peat, coal, hunting, and also 'here-yeldis, bludewitis, et merchetis mulierum, cum furca, fossa, sok, sak, tholl, theme, infrangthef, outfangtheif, pitt et gallous, cum vert vennyson, et waith' and all other liberties, profits and pertinents.[318] In contrast, fees, annuities and other allowances did not intail such comprehensive concessions. Such grants assumed a variety of forms.

Fees and pensions represented fixed allowances from the farms of one or more portions of property. From 1502 Alexander, master of Hume, royal cupbearer received an annual payment of £40 from the farms of Ettrick Forest as his fee, granted through royal letters issued under the privy seal, of which 20 marks was paid as his household fee.[319] In this case the rents were collected by the chamberlain of Ettrick Forest and disbursed to Hume. Unlike grants of pensions, assignations relieved the Ballivi ad Extra from intromitting with the rents of the lands in question and the comptroller and auditors were merely directed to allow the farm involved to the grantee. In the 1456 account of the chamberlain of Strathearn and Menteith, an allowance of £48 was recorded in the rolls for three terms since the lands of Two Kinkellis had been assigned to John Strang, squire, and the chamberlain was forbidden to intromit with the farms of the lands concerned for the period of the assignation.[320] In effect the lands had been alienated for a specific period although their rents continued to be charged to the Ballivi ad Extra in his roll. A simple assignation of farms or feu duties permitted the grantee only to extract only the custumary rents from the sitting tenants, whereas a liferent grant of a portion of property entitled the recipient either to occupy the land with his own goods or to let

---

318. ER, xiii, 69-71.

319. ER, xii, 36.

320. ER, vi, 282.

the lands to sub-tenants. A liferent charter to Isabel Elphinstone, nurse to the now dead son of James IV, on 9 March 1507-8, assigned the rents of the lands of Chapelton and other lands within the bailliery of Cunningham during the terms of the existing leases but did not grant the lands themselves until the tacks had expired when she possessed the power to ordain future tenants.[321] In January 1508-9 John Watson received a liferent concession of the lands of Petpoakis in the lordship of Brechin for his fee with the power to distrain the lands for his annual farms.[322] Certain assignations were permanently attached to a particular office. In 1511 Robert, lord Erskine was appointed keeper of Dumbarton castle for the period of nineteen years and he was to receive the profits from the lands of Cardross, Mekle Cumbrae, victuals from the lands of Kirkpatrick, an annual rent of 40 marks from Cadzow and the fishing from the water of the Leven, which were assigned to the castle.[323] Leases under the privy seal at a nominal or reduced rent represented a concession not dissimilar to an assignation. On 8 March 1500 a nine year lease of the lands of Slewdonald in Galloway was gifted to Alexander Kennedy 'in fee for service don and to be don'. Since the lease contained no 'reddendo' to the king the farm was retained by Kennedy as his fee and the chamberlain of Galloway was allowed £10 annually in his accounts for the concession.[324] When sir Andrew Wood of Largo was granted a life fee of £20 in February 1489-90 it was natural that it should be derived from the feufarm of the lands of Largo in Fife which Wood already held in feu.[325] Despite the circuitous accounting methods employed in Mediaeval Scotland, such grants in fact represented the granting of a lease of feu at a reduced rent for the purposes of patronage. On 28 March 1480 John Young and Thomas Dumbarton

---

321. RMS, ii, 3204.

322. RSS, i, 1796.

323. RSS, i, 2255.

324. RSS, ii, 492. ER, xi, 331.

325. ER, x, 121.

were granted a 19 year lease of the lands of Two Kinkells in Strathearn for a total annual farm of £16 and because the chamberlain was still charged with the former rent level of £32, an allowance of £16 was required to balance out the account.[326]

Fees, pensions and liferent grants formed an important part of royal patronage. Although the majority of household servants during the latter part of the fifteenth century received their fees and allowances directly from the comptroller but until the latter possessed sufficient funds to absorb all the claims made on his income, many royal employees were still forced to accept their annual allowances from local sources. For instance, Thomas Stewart of Minto received an annual fee of 20 marks from the farms of Dunrod and Fintelach within the lordship of Galloway from 1483 for his position as marischal of the household. However, the position seems to have varied considerably during succeeding years; from 1483 until 1485 the fee of 20 marks was paid by the chamberlain of Galloway but the wages of his servants were allowed in the account of the comptroller,[327] from 1485 to 1491 the allowance for Thomas to the chamberlain rose to £17-16-8, including the wages of his servants transferred from the comptroller's account,[328] for the year 1491-2 the fee and wages were absorbed in the account of Hugh Martin, comptroller and despite a temporary relapse to the chamberlain of Galloway for the three terms prior to Martinmas 1494, responsibility for the payment continued rested with the comptroller.[329] This confusion as to responsibility for the payment of household fees and wages was a feature of the payment of several royal employees but the general trend was away from the local sources to the comptroller. Inevitably alteration of responsibility led to duplication. In 1512 the annual fee of £10 was allowed to the Unicorn pursuivant from the

---

326. ER, ix, 120.

327. ER, ix, 246, 300.

328. ER, ix, 377, 381, x, 30, 78, 220, 285.

329. ER, x, 341, 399, xi, 255, 332.

farms of Linlithgwoshire but in a memorandum at the foot of the account it was related that the fee had also been allowed in the account of the comptroller.[330] Although the comptroller gradually assumed responsibility for many of these household fees and wages during the reign of James IV, the majority of fees were still associated with the lands from which payment was directly made to the household servant at some earlier date. In 1490 John Hume, master of the wardrobe, received an annual fee of 20 marks from the farms of the lands of Cockburn in March and even when his fee became the responsibility of the comptroller in 1492, the cash was still recorded as being derived from the same portion of land.[331]

Pensions and liferent grants were employed by the crown as the vehicle for reward, either for some particular action or general service to the crown over a period of years. It was not uncommon for land to be offered as reward for some special service or deed. In 1438 John Stewart 'Gorm' received 100 marks from the chamberlain of Mar for his part in the arrest of Robert Graham and his accomplices, sought for their role in the death of James I,[332] included in Alexander Kirkpatrick's £100 hereditary grant of land following his capture of the earl of Douglas in 1484 were £20 worth of land in Lochbrighame and £18 of land in Duns,[333] while in 1488 Walter Simpson was in receipt of liferent grant of the lands of Cessintuly and Coldoch, at an annual farm of £4-10s, for the recovery of a box containing £4,000 in gold and the sword of Robert Bruce Bruce from the battlefield of Sauchieburn.[334] Such concessions, however

---

330. ER, xiii, 408, 410.

331. ER, x, 152, 336.

332. ER, v, 55. On 15 August 1451 Robert Duncanson of Strowan received a royal charter erecting his lands of Strowan and others into a barony for his participation in the arrest of Graham. RMS, ii, 491.

333. RMS, ii, 1603. ER, ix, 519-20.

334. ER, x, 82, 187, 502.

damaging financially, were expected from a grateful monarch. An offer of 100 marks worth of land was tendered by Parliament as a token effort to discover the identity of those responsible for the death of James III, but, not unnaturally there was no claimant.[335]

There are instances of royal benevolence towards forfeited persons or members of their families which excluded the permanent return of their property. Following the forfeiture of John, earl of Ross in 1475, his wife, Elizabeth, was granted a lifegrant of £100 of land within the earldom for his honerable maintenance but more especially because she had refused to assist earl John in his campaign against the crown.[336] On 10 September 1488 sir James Douglas, the former earl of Douglas, captured as far back as 1484, was granted a pension of 300 marks for life from the lands of Methven, Apnadull, Strathbran, Glenlion and other estates in Perthshire, but during the three years until his death in 1491 allowances totalled only £395-12s.[337]

Apart from specific household offices, the resources of the royal demesne were used to remunerate those with a record of service to the crown. The reason behind many royal grants remains obscure through lack of information. A typical letter of concession resembled that granted to James Douglas of Pittendreich in June 1490 in which the latter received a liferent grant of the lands of Newtown of Spey, Redhall, Milton and other lands within the earldom of Moray for 'faithful and gracious service performed and to be performed to us by our favoured household squire'.[338] In 1481 Mary Woung, the nurse to the duke of

---

335. APS, ii, 230.

336. RMS, ii, 1227. ER, viii, 596, ix, 59. The property recorded in the concesssion was, in fact, her jointure lands which had been given to her by earl John on the occasion of their marriage.

337. RMS, ii, 1776. ER, ix, 116-7, 183, 253-4.

338. ER, x, 190-1.

Ross, was assigned £10-13-4 from the rents of the lands of Wra in Linlithgowshire which gift was converted into a life concession by 1483.[339]

There can be little doubt that there was a dramatic increase in the number and overall extent of these fees, pensions, lifegrants and assignations during the reigns of James III and IV. The accounts of the royal demesne within the shire of Linlithgow were, by no means, untypical of the general trend on most crown estates. In the 1459 account of the receiver, only £43-1-4 out of a gross charge of £140-17-8 was allowed in this way, two fees to Elizabeth of Gelria and the Carrick pursuivant and a lifegrant of the lands of Houston to sir David Hume, but by 1488, £113-1-4 out of the gross receipt of £178-10-2 was discharged for lifegrants, fees and assignations. During the final years of the reign of James IV such allowances cleared about 76% of the gross receipt, £138-5s from a gross receipt of £182-16-10.[340] An analysis of latter accounts revealed the variety of forms of concession which combined to form such a discharge, namely an annual rent of £4-6-8 to James Amisfield, household fees to the Unicorn Herald, £10, and Thomas Shaw, cook, £10-8s, a fee of 40 marks to sir Patrick Hamilton as keeper of Blackness castle, a lifegrant of the lands of Houston to sir James Sinclair, £35-16s, and of Kingscavil to sir Patrick Hamilton, £15-6-8, the assignation of the acres around the burgh of Linlithgow to the abbot of Holyrood in exchange for lands in Leith, £14-14-4, and of part of Kingscavil to sir Alexander McCulloch for the upkeep of Linlithgow palace and finally a grant of the lands of Kirkhill in mortmain to the chapel of Lestalrig, £10.[341] A significant feature of these three years, 1459, 1488 and 1512 was that, with one exception, none of the concessions or gifts continued from one account to

---

339. ER, ix, 173, 243, 400.

340. See Appendix No. B/2(c)

341. ER, xiii, 407-410

another.[342] Although this type of royal patronage did not result in any permanent alienation of royal property, the effect on royal finaances was nevertheless considerable. It would be true to say that most accounts were burdened with assignations, pensions, fees and lifegrants in the same way, although in 1512 the account of John Leslie, receiver of the lordship of Garioch recorded no such incumbrances.[343]

F. STRUGGLE BETWEEN CROWN AND PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS OVER THE POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND PENSIONS

The fifteenth century witnessed a continual struggle between the crown and various aspirants to portions of royal property. Both sides met with considerable success but the crown had to steer a course between acting against the illegal acquisition of royal property and avoiding the wholescale infringement of private rights. The prime example of how the crown reacted against wanton alienation of its patrimoney and the nature of its success is recorded in the accounts of the earldom of March. In 1457 allowances for assignations, payments and the physical occupation of estates amounted to £329, out of a gross charge of £576. James II, in an effort to remove this annual drain on his income from March, attempted to reclaim certain alienated estates, the lands of Little Spot, Pitcox, Forest of Dye, Trefontains, Brighamshiels and Lochton, and the lands of Hardens, occupied respectively by Archibald Dunbar, Patrick Dunbar of Beil, Patrick Cockburn, the abbot of Dryburgh, sir Alexander Hume and Walter Spens, at a total annual rent loss of £105-10s. These estates were claimed by the king in 1457 since the concessions had been granted by George

---

342. In 1488 and 1512 an assignment of £1 from a certain three acres and brewlands were granted to the chaplain of St. Ninian's.

343. ER, xiii, 417.

Dunbar after the forfeiture of his father, the earl of March. The claims of sir William Cranston of Corsby to the lands of Earlston, Thomas Cranston to Greenlaw, sir David Hume to Duns, sir Alexander Hume to Chirnside, Thomas Hume to Cadshiel and David Hume to Ernslaw, representing a loss of £157-5-4 in farms, were challenged by the crown since the charters were said to have been granted 'indiscreetly' and after an inquest, it was hoped that they would fall under a revocation.[344] In the 1460s the crown met with a reasonable degree of success for, of the estates occupied by the border lairds in 1457, property worth £190-11s in revenue was recovered by the early years of James III. Some claimants successfully resisted the efforts of the crown, for instance, Archibald Dunbar continued to occupy the lands of Little Spot having shown his charters to the king and his council,[345] while, in 1467 James Spens finally asserted his right to the hereditary possession of the lands of Hardenis by showing his charter of infeftment from James I.[346] The case of the lands of Cranshaws revealed not only the delay experienced by a claimant attempting to establish his right to a particular portion of land but also that, on the assumption of an earldom or lordship by the crown, the legal grants and concessions issued by the previous superior remained in force despite the change of ownership. On 20 October 1401 Archibald, earl of Douglas, shortly before the battle of Homildon, granted the lands of Cranshaws to sir John Swinton in fee and heritage[347] but in 1458 James II queried Swinton's claim to the lands.[348] In an inquest held at Berwick on 4 May 1464, sir John Swinton claimed that the land were part

---

344. ER, vi, 334-5.

345. ER, vi, 540, vii, 100, 178, 318, 402, 495.

346. ER, vii, 495. James II had claimed that the grant of James I was to endure only for the lifetime of Hugh Spens and his wife and on their deaths the estates were to return to the crown. ER, vi, 261.

347. Swintons of That Ilk, No. xii. Around 1400 Joan, countess of Douglas conceded the lands of Cranshaws to her eldest son, earl Archibald in exchange for the lands of the Halls of Airth. Ibid, No. X.

348. ER, vi, 433, 539.

of the tenandry of the earldom of March, having belonged in property to the countess of Douglas, who had conceded them to her son Archibald, earl of Douglas from whom sir John Swinton, the petitioner's grandfather, had subsequently purchased them for his service and the retour following the inquest upheld Swinton's assertion and rejected the king's claim that the lands formed part of the property of the earldom.[349]

The political career of Alexander, duke of Albany and earl of March resulted in an extensive and permanent alienation of more royal property within the earldom of March. During the crisis years of the late 1470s and early 1480s both Albany and James III vied for the support of border lairds, the former granted the lands of Mersington in heritage to William Ker and the lands of Brighamshiel to Patrick Hume of Polwart,[350] who was summoned by Parliament for treasonable assistance given to Albany, whereas the king also attempted to attract support in that region to resist Albany with hereditary gifts of Pinkerton to Colin, earl of Argyll, the cottages of Duns to John Hume, Chirnside to sir Alexander Hume, Cockburn and Todrick to David, earl of Crawford, £32 worth of land in Brighame to Alexander Bruce and the £100 concession to Alexander Kirkpatrick for his part in the capture of the earl of Douglas in 1484,[351] following the acquisition of the earldom of March from Albany.[352] The financial result of these and other hereditary gifts within the earldom of March was to ensure the permanent loss of £377-16-8 annually in farms during the reign of James IV. The purchasing of political support often proved an expensive business. In 1510 the gross farm of north and south Kintyre amounted to £462,

---

349. Swintons of That Ilk, No. xxxviii. Despite the decision of the inquest, another threat to Swinton's occupation of the lands of Cranshaws was pursued by lord Oliphant which was to endure for over twenty years.

350. RMS, ii, 1573, 1745. APS, ii, 128.

351. RMS, ii, 1564, 1571, 1572, 1599, 1603, 1638.

352. APS, ii, 147-152.

of which £269-10s was lost through the effect of tolerated occupations and royal concessions of property to royal supporters in that regions, especially Donald MacRanaldbane, who occupied £60 worth of land in that area 'by royal toleration', Angus of the Isles, Y, Colin and Gillespie MacCachane and Archibald, earl of Argyll, who, as keeper of Cairnburgh castle, was assigned farms in south Kintyre to the value of £103-9-4 annually and 2 chalders of barley from the island of Terray.[353] James IV was forced to accept the existance and legality of these concessions, even those emanating from Albany,[354] although in 1490 sir Patrick Hume of Polwart surrendered his letters of concession to the lands of Letham in the presence of the auditors of the Exchequer and the grant was cancelled.[355] Also the lands of Earlson, conceded to Archibald, earl of Angus in 1483 were resigned to the crown in 1487 only to be regranted to John Hume of Whiterig.[356] The principal benefactors from the various settlements were the border family of Hume who, by the reign of James IV, had gained hereditary possession of £189-16-8 worth of property within the earldom of March.[357] Although most hereditary concessions from the crown demesne involved the removal of the entry involving that particular portion of land from the Ballivi ad Extra accounts, yet the annual farms from these estates continued to be charged to the chamberlain of March. In addition, by 1512 allowances within the accounts were still being made out to the original grantee, now deceased, namely to the late Colin, earl of Argyll or the late George Hume of Ayton, with no mention of their heirs, almost perhaps the result of the conservative nature of the accounting system. By 1512 £414 out of a gross charge of

---

353. ER, xiii, 319-321.

354. ER, xiii, 466. The hereditary grant of the lands of Mersington to William Ker was confirmed by James III.

355. ER, x, 154.

356. ER, ix, 518, x, 128. RMS, ii, 1907.

357. See Appendix No.B/2(c)

£582 was discharged to the chamberlain of March in hereditary concessions, fees and lifegrants.[358]

It was not only in the earldom of March that the crown struggled to regain lost patrimony. From 1450 until after the death of James IV, the crown queried the claim of the heirs of Duncan, lord Campbell to a third of the lands of Glenderuel in Cowal.[359] The crown retained a long memory where its landed property was concerned, for although the baillie of Cowal received an annual allowance for the grant from 1458 until 1492, in 1494 the legality of the grant was disputed and in 1510 the occupiers were to reveal their charters at the next Exchequer in order to ensure the continuation of allowance for the concession,[360] despite having shown a 1452 charter of James II at the 1507 Exchequer.[361] The dispute continued well into the reign of James V but the final record of the grant occurred in 1528.[362]

In 1492 the account of Gilbert, lord Kennedy, baillie and chamberlain of the earldom of Carrick demonstrated both the nature and the financial effect of alienations of royal property and the attempts adopted by the crown to amend the situation. The accountant received an allowance for £200, the accumulated farms of the lands of Kirkandrews which had been gifted in heritage to the late William, lord Moneypenny by James III on 8 October 1471 under the great seal[363] but the king seems to have quickly regretted his rashness and the concession

---

358. ER, xiii, 465-7.

359. ER, vi, 48.

360. ER, x, 424-5, xiii, 336.

361. ER, xii, 506.

362. ER, xv, 167. In future the baillie was ordered to distrain for the rents.

363. RMS, ii, 1041. On 26 February 1471-2 lord Moneypenny received a further grant of lands in Kirkandrews in an exchange affected with James, lord Hamilton. RMS, ii, 1054, 1055.

was declared gifted 'minus consulte' and subsequently revoked by the king 'bene consultus'.[364] Although the grant ceased to have effect from 1482 when the lands of Kirkandrews were removed from the responsibility of the chamberlain of Carrick to that of Galloway, the farms due for the years 1472 to 1482 were irretrievably lost to the crown and lord Kennedy received an allowance 'by the consideration of the auditors'[365]. Allowance was also given to lord Kennedy for past farms of the lands of Dundonald at £48-14-8 annually, of which 24½ marks were claimed in heritage by lord Cathcart from a grant of James II, 11 marks by his chaplain and remaining lands by lord Kennedy for the maintenance of the castle.[366] The crown had attempted to reassert its claim to the lands of Dundonald since the 1450s without any success[367] and in 1482 James III accepted the situation and appointed Alan, lord Cathcart hereditary keeper of the castle of Dundonald with an assignment of the demesne lands.[368]

Also, in the lordship of Galloway, the crown struggled to retrieve property and revenue to which it claimed a right. In 1456 James II queried the right of Vadest Grearson of Lag to the possession of the lands of Kilcorse and Curarlow but on production of a charter issued by the earl of Douglas, the previous superior of Galloway, Grearson was awarded a new infeftment by the king and the lands were removed from the accountant's charge.[369] William Grearson's claim to the lands of Castlemaddy through a similar gift but his hereditary

---

364. ER, x, 327.

365. ER, ix, 195, 245. The lands of Kirkandrews were declared to be the property of the crown.

366. ER, x, 327. The total allowance amounted to £227-11-4, namely the farms from 1475 to 1482, of which a small portion had been allowed in previous accounts.

367. ER, vi, 74.

368. RMS, ii, 1530. The lands of Dundonald disappeared from the Exchequer Rolls from 1482.

369. ER, vi, 196, 346.

claim was never entertained by the crown yet Grearson's heirs continued to occupy the lands during the reign of James IV with allowance given to the chamberlain though the crown asserted his sasine to the lands was 'bad'.[370] As well as the lands of Castlemaddy, the lords of the Council, on 24 November 1500, were to inquire into the king's claim that the lands of Pollincre, claimed by Robert Charteris of Amisfield, and those of Galtway, Lowis and Knockinvane, occupied by John Gordon of Lochinver, were royal property and that these lairds had no right to collect the farms.[371] Concerning the former case, on 3 December it was decreed that the matter was to be submitted to the royal will and on 6 August 1501, James IV confirmed an earlier charter of infeftment to Charteris by James III, on 5 March 1487-8, in reward for his past and future services to the crown during crisis years of the reign.[372] The claim of Gordon of Lochinver, first recorded in the rolls in 1472, an inquiry was first ordered in 1483, was dismissed by the Lords of the Council since he had produced no evidence to support his assertion and although the last recorded allowance to the chamberlain of Galloway occurred in 1502, there is no evidence that the lands were actually leased before 1513.[373] However, administrative and accounting inefficiency contributed to the extensive delays both in discovering these lapses and arranging for a settlement. For instance, it was only in 1486 that John, lord Kennedy was forced to confess in the presence of the Lords of the Council that he and his father had retained the farms and lands of Slewdonald in Galloway and that they had submitted nothing to the chamberlain or comptroller.[374] In 1480 it was stated that Walter Ramsey of

---

370. ER, vi, 197, 350, vii, 118, xii, 257.

371. ADC, ii, 446.

372. ADC, ii, 459. RMS, ii, 1714, 2592. In the charter of March 1487-8 it was stated that Charteris's ancestor, sir Robert Charteris had held the lands but that they had been violently taken from him by James Douglas.

373. ADC, ii, 459. ER, viii, 165, ix, 380, xii, 63, 253, 257, xiii, 605.

374. ER, ix, 380.

claim was never entertained by the crown yet Grearson's heirs continued to occupy the lands during the reign of James IV with allowance given to the chamberlain though the crown asserted his sasine to the lands was 'bad'.[370] As well as the lands of Castlemaddy, the lords of the Council, on 24 November 1500, were to inquire into the king's claim that the lands of Pollincre, claimed by Robert Charteris of Amisfield, and those of Galtway, Lowis and Knockinvane, occupied by John Gordon of Lochinver, were royal property and that these lairds had no right to collect the farms.[371] Concerning the former case, on 3 December it was decreed that the matter was to be submitted to the royal will and on 6 August 1501, James IV confirmed an earlier charter of infeftment to Charteris by James III, on 5 March 1487-8, in reward for his past and future services to the crown during crisis years of the reign.[372] The claim of Gordon of Lochinver, first recorded in the rolls in 1472, an inquiry was first ordered in 1483, was dismissed by the Lords of the Council since he had produced no evidence to support his assertion and although the last recorded allowance to the chamberlain of Galloway occurred in 1502, there is no evidence that the lands were actually leased before 1513.[373] However, administrative and accounting inefficiency contributed to the extensive delays both in discovering these lapses and arranging for a settlement. For instance, it was only in 1486 that John, lord Kennedy was forced to confess in the presence of the Lords of the Council that he and his father had retained the farms and lands of Slewdonald in Galloway and that they had submitted nothing to the chamberlain or comptroller.[374] In 1480 it was stated that Walter Ramsey of

---

370. ER, vi, 197, 350, vii, 118, xii, 257.

371. ADC, ii, 446.

372. ADC, ii, 459. RMS, ii, 1714, 2592. In the charter of March 1487-8 it was stated that Charteris's ancestor, sir Robert Charteris had held the lands but that they had been violently taken from him by James Douglas.

373. ADC, ii, 459. ER, viii, 165, ix, 380, xii, 63, 253, 257, xiii, 605.

374. ER, ix, 380.

Dunnune and Edward Bonkle had raised the £20 annual farm from the lands of Manuelrig, Gunstone and Crownarland for the previous nine years 'through tolerance' and it was only now that the receiver of the king's lands within the shire of Linlithgow was ordered to inquire into the value and occupiers of the lands in question.[375] Despite this mandate, the lands remained in the hands of Ramsey and Bonkle without royal sanction until 1490.[376] From at least 1480 until 1490 the lands of Inverallan, Lupnoch, Lossintrull, Collingsdawak and Carnton in Stirlingshire were occupied by James Shaw of Sauchie, allegedly by a concession for which he possessed royal letters, but, in 1490 his claim was queried and Shaw was required to show his evidence before the next justice ayre held at Stirling in order to preserve his right.[377] From the fact that the property was in other hands by the time of the next lease in 1492, it can be assumed that Shaw's claim to these lands in Stirlingshire was not backed by sufficient documentary proof.[378]

These and other attempts by the crown during the fifteenth century to tighten up on illegal and unauthorised concessions tended to involve considerable delay which, in the majority of cases, resulted in a heavy loss of revenue to the crown. Although met with considerable success in this effort, many claimants were able either to secure legal approval of their occupation or retain the profits for long periods while the machinery of justice floundered to reach a decision. Even when the crown gained the decision of an inquest or court, it was another thing to oust the illegal occupant, especially in the outlying regions of Scotland where the local Ballivi ad Extra was either unable or unwilling to enforce royal rights. The case of the fishing of the

---

375. ER, ix, 15.

376. ER, x, 176. After 1490 the entry disappears from the Rolls.

377. ER, ix, 569, 601, 634-5, x, 668.

378. ER, x, 732-3.

river Findhorn provdes an excellent example of the crown's attempt to extract revenue from a source to which it had no right, and following over ten years of illegal exploitation of the profits of the fishing no recompense was made to the real owner for lost revenue. From the term of Martinmas 1499-1500, the chamberlain of Moray was charged with 5 lasts of salmon from the fishing rights which had been leased to the burgh of Forres.[379] On 28 December 1505 the king confirmed the charter of Robert I to the abbey of Kinloss concerning the latter's right to the profits of the fishing but reserving for the crown the fishing of rights to the Sloypule and 3 lasts of salmon from the Findhorn.[380] Until 9 December 1512 the crown had to be content with the reduced 'reddendo' of 3 lasts of salmon, but on that date, the abbey of Kinloss was granted confirmation of its right to the entire profits from the fishing with the statement that 'we understand be authentik charteris schewin to us that the abbot and convent of Kinlos is infeft of ald be our maist noble progenitouris King Robert Bruce of all the fisching of the water of Finderne' and concerning the reservation of 3 lasts of salmon, it was stated that 'we knaw that we haif na richt nor just title thairto'. Following this renunciation by the crown, the chamberlain of Moray was ordered to cease from intromitting with the salmon farm and the entire entry was to be extracted from the Exchequer Rolls.[381]

Although hereditary and life concessions were often of long duration, many other grants, pensions, fees and assignations were gifted for much shorter periods and were often under continual review by the crown. Despite the liberality of patronage during the reigns of James III and IV, two checks were placed on the majority of gifts in order to ensure that crown property continued to provide sufficient funds to pay for the cost of government and the royal household; firstly several concessions were issued only for short periods,

---

379. ER, xi, 351.

380. RMS, ii, 2904. Records of the Monastery of Kinloss, 137-8.

381 RSS, i, 2454. Records of the Monastery of Kinloss, 139-140. ER, xiii, 14, 295, 462.

namely until the king's fifteenth, twenty first or twenty fifth birthdays, for the king's pleasure or by royal tolerance, and secondly the auditors of the Exchequer continually reviewed the legality and also the need for many of these grants. The Auditors served as a check on the liberality of royal patronage in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and attempted to redress the balance upset by royal generosity.

Instructions concerning lifegrants were fairly straightforward for in 1479 a letter of assignation of £13 annually from the acres around Linlithgow to James Paterson for the duration of his life stated that the receiver of Linlithgow was to make annual payment of the sum to Paterson, 'undir al the hiest pane' and the 'quhilk soume ... salbe yerely alowit to yow in your comptis be the auditouris of oure chekker ye schewin the saide maister Johnis lettrez of ressaite yerely before ye sammyn'.

Apart from lifegrants, pensions, fees and assignations tended to be granted for short periods at a time. For instance, John, lord Darnley was assigned £40 in cash and 40 marks in kind from the farms of the island of Bute, originally until the king's fifteenth birthday,[383] on 28 April 1467 the grant was extended until the king had attained twenty one years,[384] and on 2 September 1472 a further extension was arranged until his twenty fifth birthday,[385] Thereafter Darnley was in receipt of two renewals of his grant for separate periods of seven years, one in 1477 and the other in 1484.[386] However, after the events of 1488, Darnley's gift from the farms of Bute ceased despite the fact that the grant had three years left to run. It was vital that such allowances were not permitted to continue indefinitely in the various Rolls

---

382. ER, viii, 603.

383. ER, vii, 338.

384. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 79.

385. Ibid, ii, 84.

386. Ibid, ii, 123. ER, ix, 352, 487.

as was likely to happen in accounts which were extremely conservative in character and normally based on the details recorded in those of the previous years. It was a matter of course for pensions and assignations to be allowed annually in the accounts until the auditors challenged the right. Periodically the Auditors ordered various Ballivi ad Extras not to continue the payment of a particular pension or assignation without a fresh royal mandate. Frequently a new mandate was forthcoming and the allowance continued but if not the payment, in theory, ceased immediately. From 1464 Colin, earl of Argyll received an annual fee from the farms of the lands of Houston, Kirkhill and West Mains in Linlithgowshire and in 1478 a new mandate was ordered before any further allowance would be permitted and in response Argyll acquired a renewal of the concession for three years in 1479 and by 1483 the gift was granted for life. However, in 1488 a new mandate from the new king was required to ensure further payment but this does not seem to have been forthcoming as there was no further record of that particular allowance in the following accounts.[387] From 1476 John Murray of Touchadam received a lifegrant of the lands of Galwaymore, Galwaybeg and Culcreiff in Strathearn but in 1488 the chamberlain of Strathearn was ordered to halt the allowance.[388] Although it was recorded in the 1499 account of the chamberlain of Kilmarnock that the lifegrant of £20 from the lands of Railstone had been renounced by Alexander Boyd in the Exchequer, the allowance continued for a further two years at the king's pleasure.[389] Despite two demands for new mandates in 1475 and 1478 Colin, earl of Argyll continued to draw his £20 fee from the farms of Balquidder during the reign of James III but payment ceased in 1492 when the accountant was ordered not to allow any further contribution.[390] The Auditors were careful not to permit the payment

---

387. ER, viii, 511, 603, ix, 243, x, 34.

388. ER, ix, 43, x, 42.

389. RMS, ii, 2116, ER, xi, 198, 362.

390. ER, viii, 274, 534, x, 313.

of a figure behond that quoted in the letter of grant. In 1457 John Balfour, as keeper of Falkland palace had been allowed an assignment of £23 from the farms of Fife but the chamberlain was instructed to pay a fee of only £18 as in the previous year.[391]

The increased rent levels resulting from the granting of longer leases and feus did not result in a corresponding augmentation in the size of assignations, pensions and fees. Feuing tended only to affect unassigned lands, that is estates whose farms contributed directly towards the cost of government. The lands of Myers of Auchtermuchty, £10, Parkhill, £3-6-8, and Cullessy, £14, were not granted in feufarm with the rest of the royal property within the earldom of Fife in March 1509-10 as their farms were respectively assigned to John Scrimgeour, Andrew Doule and the Marchmond Herald.[392] Those whose fees and pensions were paid by the chamberlain drew no benefit from the tendancy to augment rent in the later Middle Ages but those with lifegrants, which involved control over leasing and the profit derived from the sub-tenants, were able to benefit from the trend towards increased farms. Although the chamberlain of Linlithgowshire received an annual allowance of £35-16s for a liferent grant of the lands of Houston to sir John Sinclair, because Sinclair was then entitled to arrange the leases of sub-tenants, it was likely that he, in fact, extracted more from the lands than the sum charged to the accountant.[393] Occasionally allowance was made in the grant letter for any augmentation in the rental. On 29 October 1477 John Ross of Montgrenane was in receipt of a lifegrant of 15 marks of land in Stewarton with the additional concession that should the rents within the lordship be raised to a higher value, Ross was to have 20 marks of land in Stewarton.[394]

---

391. ER, vi, 252, 369.

392. ER, xiii, 422-9.

393. ER, xiii, 277.

394. RMS, ii, 1325.

In England after 1450, frequent acts of resumption of all grants and concessions bestowed from a specific date was designed as 'the panacia for financial reform'.[395] As a reaction against Henry VI's wanton disposition of royal lands and revenues and, given legal and literary backing in the writings of Fortescue, the demand for the resumption of all such gifts since the accession of Henry VI became one of the principal features of the opposition of Richard, duke of York in the 1450s. On the accession of Edward IV the policy of periodically resuming royal grants became a feature of late Mediaeval government in England. The proposed purpose of acts of Resumption was declared to be 'the contentyng and paiement of the expenses and charges of your Household, and all your other ordinarie charges'[396] namely as a form of fiscal retrenchment designed to facilitate an effective, financial contribution from the royal demesne towards the costs of government. From the evidence available it would seem that the act of resumption of 1450 and those promulgated later in the Parliaments of Edward IV and Henry VII were largely ineffective as financial measures, although it is true that certain leases tended to be reissued on a more business like basis and some alienated estates were in fact recovered.[397] Although the financial yield extracted from resumed lands was undoubtedly important to Edward IV, acts of resumption were also employed as a means of redistributing royal patronage in order to consolidate his political position. From the lands made available from the two statutes of 1465 and 1467 a substantial proportion was used to complete the endowment of members of the royal family and also much of the effect of these acts was undone by several petitions for exemption.

---

395. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 112.

396. Ibid, 126.

397. The 1450 Act of Resumption was a popular measure as it promised relief from the heavy direct taxation. But it included 186 exemptions and, taking a sample of 101 members of the royal household, it would seem that they were prepared to surrender grants worth £1,800 annually but retained gifts valued at £3,750.

Information concerning the acts of general revocation in Scotland is much more scanty and it is difficult to determine the exact effect of such measures. A statute, probably dated 1437, revoked all alienations of property and moveable goods in the possession of the late king and declared that no lands and possessions belonging to the king were to be granted to any person without the consent of the estates until the king had reached the age of twenty one.[398] On 2 February 1489-90 Parliament cancelled all gifts, infeftments and feus granted since the day of the coronation of James IV 'notwithstanding quhatsumever assignatioun or gift be maid therupoun under the grete sele priue sele or utheris be alluterly cassit and annullit'.[399] It would appear that the king was entitled to resume grants and gifts made during his minority at three points, at the age of fifteen, twenty one and twenty five, but the latter was the most important as it marked the final recognition of the monarch's majority. On 10 July 1476, twenty five years after the birth of James III, Parliament passed an act of general revocation of all infeftments, and gifts of lands, annual rents, advocations, wards, reliefs, feus, the concession of lands in regality and lengthy grants of the office of keeper of a royal castle, which had been made 'in prejudice' to the king.[400] However, the statute of revocation following James IV's twenty first birthday provided a far more lengthy account of the items which were liable to come under the scope of this act. The preamble recited that 'persounis constitute in zoutheid and tender age quhilkis ar greitlie dampnageit and skaithhit in thair heritage be imprudent alienationis donatiounis venditiounis and permutatiounis in the samin may at thair perfectiounof age mak reuocatioun and reductioun of thingis done preiudiciall to thame in thair minoriteis and tender age' and there followed a comprehensive compilation of the various grants under review, including the usual alienations of

---

398. APS, ii, 31.

399. APS, ii, 219.

400. APS, ii, 113.

royal property and feudal incidents, but also gifts of offices, other than those granted in heritage, grants of new infeftment, regality, hereditary alienation of lands escheated through bastardy, creations of baronies, patronage and advocation of kirks and benfices and leases issued for long terms.[401] Unfortunately the revocation issued on the king's twenty fifth birthday has not been recorded.[402]

Despite the comprehensive nature of these statues and the determination to ensure against the permanent alienation of royal property and rights during the minority, there is little doubt that such a measure did not effect the substantial cancellation of royal grants nor help to swell royal revenues to any great extent. Attached to the statute of 1493 was a statement that the lands donated to the earl of Bothwell and sir John Ross were not to fall under the above revocation.[403] In the case of the former, although Bothwell received a royal charter of confirmation in 1498 of his concession of the lands of Bothwell, Crichton and others of 1488, no administrative fee seems to have been levied.[404] Although only two exemptions were recorded in the Parliamentary records, undoubtedly there were many others.

From the meagre evidence available in public records, it would appear that the king's revocation did not result in the decimation of royal grantees. In fact, the majority of royal concessions and gifts granted during the period of a royal minority continued after the Act of Revocation had been passed. Many royal grantees were forced to seek a fresh charter of concession in order to legalise the gift rendered invalid by the revocation. In the 1499 account of the chamberlain of Cowal, 7 marks of the lands of Clonyarg and Boraman within Rosineath had been gifted to Colin Campbell Knightson by royal charter granted

---

401. APS, ii, 236.

402. TA, i, 383. The revocation was passed on 16 March 1497-8 at Duchal.

403. APS, ii, 237.

404. RMS, ii, 1784, 2452.

before the revocation and afterwards ratified by similar letters under the great seal, issued at Kintyre on 3 August, 1498.[405] Similarly, on 20 February 1489-90 Andrew Wood of Largo received a life fee of £20 annually from the lands of Largo in Fife, which lands he already held of the crown in feufarm, and after the revocation he received royal confirmation of his concession on 4 June 1498.[406] On 4 July 1498 Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy received a fresh feu charter of royal estates within the lordship of Desschier and Toyer which had been given to Duncan during the king's minority but had subsequently fallen under the general revocation.[407] A hereditary concession of the lands of Creich in Fife granted to John Liddale during the minority of James IV was regranted to the same person on 14 April 1498.[408] The effect of the general revocation was therefore mitigated by means of regranting letters of concession to the original benefactors. Although there is no conclusive evidence, it is likely that these regrants were subject to the usual administrative fees and compositions although some may even have avoided such an incumbrance.[409]

The real benefit of the weapon of revocation to the crown was, however, long term, as a legal device whereby the king could resume certain lands, pensions and gifts which had been conceded during his minority if the occasion was suitable. There can be little doubt that the stringent enforcement of the statute of revocation would have resulted in the alienation of many sections of society from the crown and a complete undermining of the purpose of patronage. In 1500 the Auditors of the Exchequer queried the right of Patrick Hume of Fastcastle and sir Thomas Hume to the lease of the lands of Cockburnspath in

---

405. ER, xi, 184.

406. ER, x, 121, xi, 79.

407. RMS, ii, 2091, 2428. The original feu grant was dated 5 March 1491-2.

408. RMS, ii, 2401.

409. It is unfortunate that the period immediately after the revocation of March 1497-8 is not covered by the surviving Treasurers' Accounts. The gap lasted from July 1498 to February 1500-1.

the earldom of March claiming that the tack, although it had several years still to run, had been granted during the king's minority and fell under his revocation.[410] To force the lessees to seek a fresh lease entailed the payment of an extra grassum. The technicality of revocation was employed by James IV in an effort to destroy the claim of certain 'tenants' of the earldom of Fife whose pretentions had involved the crown in a continual loss of revenue. Concerning William Sellar's claim to the feu of the lands of Greenyards the lords of the Council declared the lands to be 'annexed' and William's gift to originate from 'James II's non age' while that of Michael Balfour of Burly to the lands of Balgarvy and the mill of Skeauch was dismissed as the lands were under the king's revocation 'the tyme of the saide Mychell charter'.[411] James III attempted to extract the full rent of £110 from the lands of Glencairny in 1477 by invoking the general revocation and cancelling the lease of Duncan Grant who had only submitted an annual farm of £60 but despite this threat, in 1479 Grant received a new letter of lease from the king at the smaller farm.[412]

Nevertheless, there is evidence that certain concessions were cancelled following the general revocation. On 1 June 1490, James Douglas or Pettindreich received a lifegrant of the lands of Newton of Spey and others in Moray, paying an annual farm of £20-4-3 but, on reaching the age of twenty five years, James IV revoked the letters of grant at the feast of St. Patrick 1497 and they were torn up at the following Exchequer.[413] Also, on 14 January 1500-1 Duncan Stewart, heir of Appin, was in receipt of a lifegrant of £20 of lands in the

---

410. ADC, ii, 459.

411. ADC, ii, 493.

412. ER, viii, 407, 523, 578. Although an annual farm of £60 was quoted on Grant's lease, the chamberlain of Moray was persistently charged with an annual rent of £110 from the lands of Glencairny.

413. ER, ix, 176, xi, 176. There was no further record of this grant in the rolls.

shire of Perth which had been in the possession of a certain John MacCoull by a royal gift conceded during the king's minority which was subsequently revoked following the Act of Resumption.[414] It is possible that the Act of Resumption affected other gifts but such hypothesis is difficult to substantiate through the lack of evidence.

Much has been made of the effect of the king's revocation of the charters of confirmation granted to the former vassals of the lord of the Isles following the latter's forfeiture.[415] Despite the terms of the revocation, there is no evidence that the holders of these estates were actually removed.

There is little evidence to suggest that the king's revocation was an excessively oppressive measure in the later Middle Ages for no attempt was made, or would have been tolerated, to effect a substantial and systematic overturn of territorial possessions, pensions and various assignations. The revocation was, in many ways, merely an administrative device, designed to extract a composition from existing holders requiring a further royal confirmation and also to provide a legal excuse for the resumption of certain lands, assignations and leases if it suited the crown or if the grantee became difficult. It also provided a check on the excessive largess of a royal minority, for gifts and pensions could be reviewed on the attainment of the king's majority. Also, during the royal non-age, many such concessions, as mentioned above, were intentionally granted only for the duration of the minority.

Ecclesiastical endowment was also a feature of the property rolls. In the account of the chamberlain of royal land north of the Spey during the latter years of James II, a total of £54-11-9 was paid annually to various chaplains

---

414. RMS, ii, 2565.

415. RMS, ii, 2191, 2200-2, 2216, 2281, 2286, 2287.

praying for the souls of deceased monarchs or of notable local landlords.[416]

G. THE OFFICE OF BALLIVI AD EXTRA

During the fifteenth century, most of the annual farms from royal property were accounted for at the yearly Exchequer by Ballivi ad Extra, the king's baillies outside the burghs. This designation tended to include a variety of officials of different designation, receivers, mairs, serjeants but most commonly chamberlains. Although the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra are only recorded in the Exchequer Rolls from the final years of the reign of James I, there is evidence to suggest that the office existed not only during the earlier years of the reign but also prior to the property acquisitions of the fifteenth century. During the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the majority of receipts from royal estates were included in the sheriffs' accounts, but occasionally royal baillies were appointed to supervise certain areas. For instance, in the years before the wars of independence, accounts were recorded of the baillie of Tynedale and Inverkoich and also of the farmers of Formartine and Dull.[416A] The property accounts which have survived for the reigns of James I and II formed only a small portion of those which were compiled in the early fifteenth century. Since arrears totals of four cows and £18-3-3 were recorded respectively in the first surviving accounts of the baillie of the earldom of Carrick in 1434 and the receiver of the earldom of Fife in 1451, with mention made of the last account, it is obvious that accounts earlier than those now surviving were in existance.[417]

---

416. ER, vi, 479-80.

416A. ER, i, 3, 16, 21, 23, 25, 33, 49.

417. ER, iv, 595, v, 470.

Although the office of Ballivus ad Extra existed in previous centuries, it was only with the systematic acquisition of a royal demesne from 1424 that it really developed as the principal local landed officer of the crown. In the first half of the fifteenth century, large estates tended to incorporate into a single account, the earldoms of Menteith and Lennox were combined in a 1434 account and in 1460 all the royal property north of the River Dee was included in the account of Thomas Carmichael,[418] but as the century progressed the trend was reversed and accountants became responsible for smaller sections of the royal demesne. For instance, by 1513 separate accounts were rendered for the lands of Petty and Brauchly, Glencairny, the Black Isle and royal property within the shires of Elgin and Forres, all of which had previously come under the responsibility of the chamberlain of Moray.[419]

The employment of specially appointed Ballivi ad Extra to collect the farms and other profits from the royal demesne, gradually ousting the sheriff as the vehicle of collecting revenue from crown property, was designed to ensure the efficient gathering of such income, especially with the rapid acquisition of crown territory in the fifteenth century. In England after the accession of Edward IV a similar policy was adopted, the Exchequer was removed from the administration of royal property and selected receivers, with considerable ability and financial experience, were appointed by the crown to ensure the competent collection of the fruits from the rapidly expanding royal demesne.[420] The rolls of the Ballivi ad Extra included all those who intromitted with the rents derived from the royal demesne and in the second half of the fifteenth

---

418. ER, iv, 589, vi, 647-9.

419. ER, vi, 477, xiii, 513, 517, 544, 551.

420. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 158-168. In England, only highly professional men, often with a family history of service in this manner, were employed in such offices and although many Ballivi ad Extra in Scotland were of similar background, others were appointed according to their political influence both at the centre and in the locality.

century this also emcompassed lessees and feuars. The leasing and feuing of large areas of crown demesne which had previously been administered by a chamberlain or receiver represented an attempt on the part of the crown to increase the efficiency of its local property officials. The chamberlain was not provided with sufficient incentive to extract the maximum from the estates under his jurisdiction, for, although he was personally responsible for the revenue charged to him in his account, allowances for waste, reduced rents, unlet lands and other losses were not difficult to obtain. To the lessee and feuar, the grant was regarded as an investment, for, in return for a fixed annual outlay to the comptroller, the former were entitled to collect what they could from the sub-tenants. For instance, by the terms of the nine year lease of the lordship of Garioch to William Forbes of Tollis on 5 September 1508, the lessee's sole obligation to the crown was the regular submission of the farm of £151 and 11 marts and, in return, he was granted the profits not only from the actual lands but also from the forests, meadows, hunting, fishing, average, carriage, hereyelds along with the power of chamberlain in order to collect all the rents and other duties and, if need be, poind for outstanding payments.[421] The benefit to the crown centred round the fact that, in accordance with the terms of the letter of lease or feu, the grantee was bound to submit a fixed annual 'reddendo', apart from certain agreed allowances, to the comptroller.

The post of Ballivus ad Extra essentially attracted two types of person, the powerful local landowner or a scion of his house on the one hand and, on the other, the professional civil servant. The appointment of local landlords as fiscal officers of the crown tended to be confined to the more outlying regions of royal property, for the Gordons frequently accounts for royal income from the earldom of Mar and other lands in the North,[422] the earl of Argyll monopolised

---

421. RSS, i, 1724.

422. ER, ix, 384, 387, 389.

the office of chamberlain of Cowal, Rosneath and Kintyre,[423] while lord Kennedy was frequently responsible for the farms of the area around the earldom of Carrick and Arran.[424] Local lairds were also employed for, in 1506 sir Alexander Irvine of Drum intromitted with the revenue from the lands of Kintore, Ninian Stewart with Bute, sir Walter Ogilvy of Bone with Petty and Brauchly, sir David Sinclair with Ross and the Black Isle, William Forbes of Towis with Strathdon and Garioch and John Dunbar of Mochrum with Galloway.[425] Such appointments often formed part of the more substantial granting of royal offices within a locality which were bestowed on a powerful yet acceptable magnate or laird not only as a reward for loyal service to the crown but also as a means of extending royal influence in that region. As well as various other border offices, including the warden of the east march, during the reign of James IV, Alexander, lord Hume retained the appointments of baillie of Ettrick Forest and Steward of the earldom of March.[426] Many other areas of royal property were administered by professional men, often with previous financial experience. Such appointments were largely confined to the more central areas of crown demesne over which such persons could exercise control with less fear of violent resistance. For instance, Thomas Simpson, who occupied the offices of comptroller, receiver-general and custumar of Edinbutgh during the reign of James II, also retained the office of receiver and steward of the earldom of Fife between 10 August 1463 and 9 August 1488,[427] while later Ballivi ad Extra of the earldom included comptroller, Patrick Hume of Polworth[428] and treasurers David Beaton of Creich[429]

---

423. ER, ix, 109, xii, 504, 572.

424. ER, ix, 408, 427.

425. ER, xii, 406, 415, 428, 449, 452,457, 459.

426. RMS, ii, 1921, 2027.

427. ER, vii, 263, x, 18. Simpson held the offices of comptroller, receiver-general and custumar of Edinburgh during the reign of James III, ER, viii, 188, 211, 252, 287, 311, 390, ix, 274, 399, 575, 613. RMS, ii, 1076. He also held the office of keeper of Falkland manor.

428. ER, xi, 250, 289.

429. ER, xii, 188, 477. TA, ii, 1, 163.

and James, abbot of Dunfermline.[430]

Lengths of appointment seem to vary considerably, In 1488 Alexander Hume was appointed to the office of baillie of Ettrick for 19 years,[431] while in 1503 James Boyd became chamberlain of Stewarton for the king's pleasure[432], a common arrangement which enabled the crown to effect the removal of an inefficient or corrupt officer. In practice, the length of tenure must have been dependent on the efficiency of the officer concerned and also the political climate. There is evidence of fairly extended tenures of office, for Adam Mure retained the office of chamberlain of Galloway from 1462 until 1492 while Alexander, lord Hume was responsible for the royal revenues from the earldom of March for the entire reign of James IV.[433] However, unless the office was the monopoly of a particular family - namely Campbell's connection with the office of baillie of Cowal - there usually existed a fairly rapid overturn of Ballivi ad Extra. The receiver of the farms of Linlithgowshire, for example, witnessed nine separate appointments during the reign of James III, with many lasting no more than a single year.[434] The unpopularity of certain offices may have resulted from the fact that they had proved to be an uneconomical investment in which financial losses were common and the amount of work involved considerable. Although many of the aristocratic holders would have engaged deputies to perform the menial tasks of the office, nonetheless ultimate responsibility rested with the person of the baillie. In addition, slackness in the administration of the office and a steady drain of revenue may have encouraged the crown to replace certain officials. However, the political situation seems

---

430. ER, xii, 440, 520, xiii, 1, 153, 282, 422, 501. TA, iii, 1, 211.

431. RMS, ii, 1921.

432. RSS, i, 963.

433. See Appendix No. A/1(e)

434. See Appendix No. A/1(f)

to have had some effect on the officials responsible for the collection of profits from crown property. Although many Ballivi ad Extra retained their charges following the political unheaval of 1488, there appears to have been a limited clearout of the supporters of the late king. In 1488 Laurence Bertram, receiver of Linlithgow was replaced by William, lord St. John, who also became the new treasurer to James IV,[435] and from 1 July 1488 Alexander Hume of that Ilk replaced Simon Salmon in the office of chamberlain of March.[436] The fate of the office of the chamberlain of Fife during the crisis year revealed the desire of the party in power to fill such fiscal offices with loyal supporters. From 1463 the office had been efficiently administered by Thomas Simpson of Knockhill but on 22 March 1487-88, as part of the build up to the confrontation with the rebels, the office of sheriff, chamberlain and steward of Fife was transferred to Nicholas Ramsey for nineteen years despite the fact that royal letters of concession had been previously granted to Simpson and others.[437] This extremely high handed action by James III in favour of Ramsey, who obviously retained the king's confidence, does not seem to have endured for long since Thomas Simpson accounted at the Exchequer on 9 August 1488 for the receipts from Fife for the entire year and, on his dismissal in that year, the office of chamberlain was transferred to Patrick Hepburn of Beynstone while those of sheriff and steward were granted to Alexander Hepburn of Quhitsum.[438]

The annual fee payable to Ballivi ad Extra, rarely beyond 20 marks and

---

435. ER, x, 32, 88. TA, i, 166.

436. ER, x, 126, 129. RMS, ii, 2027. Simon Salmon held the office, off and on, from 1 April 1451. See Appendix No.A/1(i)

437. RMS, ii, 1721.

438. ER, x, 118. RMS, ii, 1733. Nicholas Ramsey, possibly a relative of John Ramsey, lord Bothwell, received a lease of the lands and mill of Balkerose in Fife in 1487. ER, ix, 652. In addition, he seems to have acted as a receiver of revenue bound for the king's private doffers, for, in 1486 and again in 1488, he was responsible for the receipt of £50 and £96 from the farms of Strathdee and Cromar which were delivered into the coffers of James III. ER, ix, 385, x, 14.

frequently considerably less, was hardly an attractive incentive for such an important office. The majority of accountants merely received their annual fees from the surplus cash after other allowances and payments had been met, but, during the reign of James III, the rangers of the three wards of Ettrick, Yarrow and Tweed were in receipt of an annual assignment on particular steeds.[439] In addition, many of the fees were usually in arrears[440] and were even withheld by the auditors if the account rendered at the Exchequer was not satisfactory. In 1455, because of the disordered nature of his accounts and since he had not as yet raised the Whitsun farms of the king's property between the Dee and the Spey, Alexander Young's fee as royal chamberlain was not allowed to him in his account.[441] On the other hand efforts were made to encourage the efficiency of these local accountants. In 1473 Adam Mure, chamberlain of Galloway, received, in addition to his annual fee of 20 marks, an allowance of £4 for his labours and expenses riding, at the time of the present Exchequer, to collect outstanding rents and arrears and also arresting defaulters.[442]

In many ways the Scottish Ballivi ad Extra could be likened to the English receiver, the latter being introduced into royal fiscal administration by Edward IV. Both contained professionally trained officers, although in many regions in Scotland away from the centre local magnates tended to be employed, certain families concentrated inestate management, the Leventhorpes in the Duchy of Lancaster and the Wardropes in the Kinclaven and other crown property in Perthshire, both were directly responsible to the crown for their receipts and both collected revenue from farmers and other menial rent collectors. Also in both cases, these officials did undertake certain tasks in estate management when

---

439. ER, ix, 414-8.

440. ER, v, 571.

441. ER, xi, 72-3.

442. ER, viii, 163, 166.

other officials, such as surveyors in England or the comptroller and commissioners in Scotland were not appointed; for instance replenishing royal stock, making new leases, ejecting insolvent or bad tenants and authorising repairs.

H. EXPENSES OF BALLIVI AD EXTRA

Royal patronage was an expensive burden on the gross revenue derived from the royal demesne but it was, by no means, the only one. The local Ballivi ad Extra was liable to sustain the fiscal cost of various local expenses. These expenses were paid through the medium of the local accountant. The most regular, and frequently the most costly, type of expense was connected with the annual payment of the fees of local officials. The fees paid to the keepers of local castles often proved to be heavy liabilities, depending on the importance of the stronghold. During the 1480s, for instance, the chamberlain of Stirlingshire was allowed £80 annually to pay the keeper of Stirling castle, the chamberlain of Mar £66-13-4 for Kildrummy castle, the receiver of Linlithgowshire 40 marks for Blackness castle, the baillie of Cowal £18 for Dunoon castle and the ranger of Ettrick Forest £6 for Newark castle.[443] Although towards the end of the fifteenth century these fees tended to become regularised, they did appear to vary according to the status and importance of the holder. During the 1450s and 1460s when William Murray of Polmais was keeper of Stirling castle an annual fee of 50 marks was paid from the farms of Tilliecoultry, but when Gilbert, lord Kinnedy assumed the office in the Whitsun term of 1464, the fee was elevated to £80 annually.[444] This trend was even more noticeable at Kildrummy castle, in 1438 Alexander, lord of Gordon seems to have been in receipt

---

443. See Appendix No.

444. ER, vi, 65, 238, 325, vii, 59, 65, 187, 346, 392-3.

of an annual fee of £200,[445] During the 1450s until the removal of the Douglas threat, both the earl of Huntly and sir James Crichton of Frendraugh received annual fees of £100,[446] but subsequently when Patrick, lord Glammis assumed control of the castle the fee was reduced to 100 marks and £20 assigned from the farms of the demesne of Kildrummy and Migvy and after 1458 only the latter allowance seems to have been forthcoming.[447] From 1462 the master of Huntly received £26-13-4 from the rents of Kildrummy, Migvy and Kindrochit for keeping the two royal castles of Kildrummy and Kindrochit with an additional 40 marks through the mandate of Mary of Guelders[448] but when the office was transferred to sir Henry Kinghorn only the former payment was paid to the keeper.[449] However, following the return of the Mar accounts to the Exchequer Rolls in 1485 George, earl of Huntly was granted an annual fee of 100 marks for custody of Kildrummy castle.[450] Apart from the fees payable from local customs accounts - the keeper of Edinburgh castle received 200 marks from the local custumars[451] while the keepers of Berwick castle during its short retention in Scottish hands in the 1460s and 1470s normally derived their fees from the custumars of Berwick and Haddington[452] - those obtained from royal property tended to come from land in close proximity to the castle itself. The demesne lands of Bonnington and Blackness were situated just south of Blackness castle, the lands of Kelton and

---

445. ER, v, 61.

446. ER, v, 463, 518, 600, 652, vi, 70, 269.

447. ER, vi, 269, 361, 436, 514, 630, vii, 86. The assignment of the demesne of Kildrummy and Migvy was only paid to the earl of Huntly for the Martinmas term of 1454. Lord Glammis also received £6-13-4 from the demesne lands of Kindrochit for the custody of the local estate.

448. ER, vii, 86, 163, 462, 555, 559.

449. ER, vii, 561, 649, viii, 79.

450. ER, ix, 388.

451. ER, ix, 79. ix no.

452. ER, viii, 118-9, 188, 251, 456. During the 1460s Robert Lauder of Edrington received his annual fee of 200 marks from the revenues of the earldom of March. ER, vii, 317, 400, 494.

Threave were located close to the castle of Threave while the lands of Cardross, Rosneath, Cumbrae and Cadzow were not too distant from Dumbarton castle.[453]

The holders of these offices were essentially divided into two main types. In the first place appointment to a royal castle in the more outlying regions of the country tended to be of lengthy duration, even hereditary, and frequently involved members of the dominant local family which employed such a gift to strengthen even further their political and social dominance of the neighbourhood. The earl of Argyll was the hereditary keeper of Dunoon castle while on 13 December 1482 Alan, lord Cathcart was granted the hereditary office of custodian of Dundonald castle.[454] Local government positions were much sought after by members of the nobility and the more powerful lairds as the vehicle for consolidating their position in the locality. Following the dismissal of John Stewart, sheriff of Bute, from the office of keeper of Rothesay castle in 1465 the office was bestowed on John, lord Darnley, later the earl of Lennox, who retained it until 1500 when Ninian Stewart received the office.[455] John, earl of Lennox further extended his power in the south west with his appointment to the office of keeper of Dumbarton castle in 1488 following the dismissal of Andrew, lord Avandale.[456] The grant of the custody of an important royal castle often included several extremely wide powers. On 16 January 1508-9 Alexander, earl of Huntly was appointed to the hereditary office of keeper of Inverness castle and included in the letter of concession were the office of

---

453. A letter of gift under the great seal to sir John Colquhon of Luss concerning the custody of Dumbarton castle mentioned that his fee was not derived from the lands of Cardross, Cumbrae, Cadzow and the annual rent and flour from Paisley, at £86-13-4 in cash and 5 chalders of meal and 3 chalders, 2 bolls of barley annually.

454. RMS, ii, 1350. ER, viii, 508, xiii, 335.

455. ER, vii, 405, xi, 327. Fraser, Lennox Book, ii, 78.

456. RMS, ii, 1794.

sheriff, the assignation of 102 marks of royal property within the sheriffdom of Inverness as his fee as keeper, the power to hold court within the bounds of Ross, Caithness, Lochaber and other areas in the north, the power to build inside the fortress and appoint deputies or captains.[457] In order to attract the support of the earl of Huntly as a bulwark of royal power in the north it was essential that James IV gave him sufficient power and property so that he could fulfil his role with confidence. In fact the association of the office of sheriff and keeper of the principal royal castle within the shire was a common feature of the designation of royal offices in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. On 8 February 1498-99 sir Patrick Hamilton received, along with the custody of Blackness castle and the associated fee from crown property, not only the office of sheriff of Linlithgow but also the power to extract the profit from the salt pans on the shore inside the bounds of the lands of Blackness.[458] Not unnaturally, there seems to have been considerable demand for these offices, for on 18 June 1489 Hugh, lord Montgomery receive a lifegrant of Rothesay castle but the evidence suggests that lord Darnley resisted his challenge.[459] Secondly, the office of keeper of Edinburgh castle and other royal strongholds near the capital tended to reflect the changing political scene. The office was held by Archibald, earl of Douglas for life during the Albany regencies, by sir William Crichton during the early part of the reign of James II, by the bishop of St. Andrews during and immediately following the Douglas rising, by the Boyds in the 1460s, by Colin, earl of Argyll and John, earl of Atholl in the reign of James III and by Patrick, earl

---

457. RMS, ii, 3286. Included in the 'reddendo' was an obligation on the part of Huntly to build on the mound of Inverness a tiled hall of 100 feet in length, 30 feet in breadth and same dimensions in height and a kitchen and chapel.

458. RMS, ii, 2480.

459. RMS, ii, 1851. ER, x, 226, 268.

of Bothwell for several years after Sauchieburn.[460] To both the crown and any ruling faction, the safe custody of Edinburgh castle was essential. Although both James III and IV employed powerful magnates loyal to the crown to control the castle - men like Colin, earl of Argyll and Patrick, earl of Bothwell - there was also a tendancy from the later fifteenth century to utilise persons of lower social status, whose elevated position was dependent on the goodwill of the crown. The loyalty of such persons was probably more reliable than members of the noble class. Thus, during the reign of James III the post of keeper of Edinburgh castle was assigned to men like Thomas Oliphant,[461] David Crichton[462] and sir John Lundy[463] while during his son's right, following the departure of Bothwell, the office remained under the permanent control of sir Patrick Crichton of Cranstone. Being a border laird who had made considerable investment in the leasing of royal property in Ettrick Forest, it was not surprising that his annual fee of 200 marks should be derived from the farms of Ettrick Forest.[464] Crichton seems to have held the office uninterrupted from Easter 1493, following the dismissal of Laurence, lord Oliphant, until 1513.[465]

Until the mid fifteenth century the warden of the Scottish marches received no actual fee, merely the expenses incurred by truce days. Initially fees tended to vary considerably in amount, William Douglas of Sunderland, between

---

460. See Appendix No.

461 ER, xiii, 28.

462. ER, viii, 253, 312, 390, 466, 547, 629, ix, 79.

463. ER, ix, 548.

464. ER, x, 505, xi, 208, 400, xii, 35, 113, 317, 391, 536, xiii, 34, 177, 351, 411, 524. More specifically he seems to have drived his fee from the farms of the lands of Montbergeris, Catslak and Blackgrane which were let to Crichton for an annual rent of £266-13-4.

465. ER, x, 505.

1465 and 1467, and James, earl of Buchan, between 1474 and 1482, were in receipt of annual fees of 200 marks, as wardens of the middle march,[466] but when Archibald, earl of Angus was appointed warden of the middle march in 1482, the fee rose to 300 marks annually.[467] Responsibility for the payment of the fee seems to have rested with the border Ballivi ad Extra of Ettrick Forest, March and Galloway. Although Douglas and Buchan received full payment for the terms under consideration, allowances for the annual fee of Angus fell drastically below the required level, for he only received a total submission of £314-18-2 for the years 1483 to 1489, for which a gross fee of £1,200 was due.[468] After Sauchieburn the office of warden of the east march was bestowed on Alexander Hume on 25 August 1489, while that of the middle and west was presented to Patrick, earl of Bothwell on 6 July the same year, both for the duration of seven years.[469] Although the annual fee payable to the warden of east march was regularised to £100 payment from the farms and grassums of royal property on the borders was haphazard. For instance, between 1489 and 1496 Bothwell received only £1,109 of his full fee of £1,400 for his two posts and between 1489 and 1495 Alexander Hume was allowed only £518 of his full fee of £600.[470] Payment of these fees was frequently in arrears. In 1506 the chamberlain of Ettrick was allowed £140 to the earl of Bothwell as part payment of his fee as warden of the middle and west marches, which offices he had departed before 5 March 1503-4.[471] However, from 1503, Alexander, lord Hume received full payment of his annual fee of £200 from the farms of Ettrick Forest

---

466. ER, vii, 400, 493, viii, 208, 483, 590, ix, 185.

467. ER, ix, 271.

468. ER, ix, 271, 319, 419, 422, x, 166,172.

469. ER, x, 100, 156-7. RMS, ii, 1874, 1893.

470. ER, 100, 163-171, 292, 344-6, 432-4, 504-7, 571, 602.

471. ER, xii, 392.

as warden of the east and middle marches.[472] During this period appointments to the office of warden was confined to powerful border barons who already retained considerable wealth and prestige in that region and to whom many of the local royal offices were bestowed in order to facilitate the efficient execution of their office.[473]

These local appointments, not only provided the recipient with considerable power over the locality but also fairly substantial material rewards. The monopoly of royal offices, especially in the borders, by the Humes and Hepburns after Sauchieburn revealed the desire for such items of patronage. In the few years after 1488 Patrick, ear of Bothwell was appointed to the offices of warden of the middle and west marches, keeper of Edinburgh, Linlithgow, Threave and Lochmaben castles at a total annual salary of £411-6-8 from royal property and great customs,[474] and Alexander Hume was granted the custody of Stirling and Newark castles and wardenship of the east march.[475] However, as James IV began to assert his authority many of these offices were regranted to other favoured persons and thus spreading the load of responsibility and power. For instance, on 10 January 1490-1 William, lord St. John, the king's treasurer, was granted custody of both Blackness castle and Linlithgow palace until the king's twenty fifth birthday[476] while by 1492 the charge of Edinburgh castle had passed to Laurence, lord Oliphant at an increased fee of £200.[477]

Other, more menial local officials also received their fees from the

---

472. ER, xii, 318, 392, xiii, 34, 179, 352, 412, 527. However, during the reign of James V these salaries were paid directly by the treasurer. Rae, The Administration of the Scottish Border, 29.

473. For details concerning the function and the duties of the wardens in the sixteenth century, see Rae, The Administration of the Scottish Border.

474. RMS, ii, 1741, 1743, 1799, 1874, 1875.

475. RMS, ii, 1893, 1919, 1921.

476. RMS, ii, 2002, 2003.

477. ER, x, 388.

receipts of the royal demesne. In 1451 the receiver of Fife was responsible for the fees of a host of local servants; £3-6-8 was submitted annually to Thomas Dravar for making the king's malt at Falkland, £2-13-4 to the gardner at the palace, £2 to William Borrowman for keeping the park at Falkland and for the upkeep of the palings, and fees of between £1 and £1-10s was paid to the four mairs of the earldom, who probably assisted the receiver in the collection of royal revenue.[478]

When John Strachan was appointed gardner of Falkland on 24 April 1500 he was provided with a fee of four marks, grass for six cows and a horse, and 2 chalders of oats, for which he provided the king and the captain of Falkland palace with fruit, onions and herbs. For his annual fee from the chamberlain of Fife, Strachan was to make the annual provision of 4 barrels of onions.[479] In the accounts of royal property between the Dee and the Spey, allowances were registered for a series of local officials, £1 each for the four mairs of the earldom, 1 mark for the mair of Kintore and 2 marks annually for the mair of Balvany, 10 marks of the lands of Blalok were assigned to Thomas Forbes, Toscheoderache of the earldom of Mar, and 1 mark from the farms of Cormuly for the forester of Strathdee.[480] The accounts of the Fife Ballivi ad Extra were repeatedly burdened with heavy local expenses. £16-13-4 was paid annually to local farmers for the mowing and harvesting of the hay in the meadows of Falkland and Auchtermukty while, during the 1450s and 1460s the accountant paid for the expenses of the king, his family, his household and other servants when they came within the jurisdiction of the receiver of Fife. Between 26 May 1452 and 15 July 1454 the accountant was allowed £196 for the expenses of the royal court

---

478. ER, v, 471-3.

479. RSS, i, 518. ER, xi, 297.

480. ER, vi, 436. The Toscheoderache is described as the 'deputy of the mair of fee' by Jameson but was clearly a minor local official of considerable antiquity.

at St. Andrews and Falkland. £15-13-2 contributed towards the expenses of the wages and upkeep of the comptroller's servants at Falkland from Christmas 1452 until 14 April 1453 and over £44 was recorded in a certain expense book written by the hand of Forsyth, the king's steward, for the cost of the visit of the royal court for almost two months in 1453, which book remained with James Paterson, the accountant since the comptroller, master Richard Forbes had refused to accept the expenses.[481] The 1438 account of the chamberlain of Mar listed a miscellaneous collection of local expenses incurred by the accountant, £9-5-8 for the carriage of various victuals and the driving of the king's horses and cattle, £18-12-6 for expenses around the custody and provisioning of these beasts, £56-18-6 was submitted to the various grangers of Kildrummy, Migvy, Feithly and others for the administration of their granges, which included the purchase of ploughs and the expenses of auditors appointed to hear the accounts of the grangers of Kildrummy and Durnosheils and allowances were made to local husbandmen for marts, at 5s each, and oats, at 4d a boll, provided for the royal household.[482] These entries reflected the type of local expense likely to be incurred by later Ballivi ad Extra. The Ballivi ad Extra sustained the cost of multifarious local expenses in his account, including the cost of holding justice ayres within the accountant's jurisdiction, the expenses of commissioners letting crown property and various other activities too numerous to mention.[483] The upkeep and repair of the more outlying and less important royal castle was generally the responsibility of the Ballivi ad Extra. In 1438 over £20 was spent by Adam Falconer, chamberlain of Mar, for certain repairs undertaken inside Kildrummy castle[484] while in 1489 and

---

481 ER, v, 684-690.

482. ER, vi, 58-61.

483. ER, v, 25, 421, vi, 253.

484. ER, v, 57-9.

1490 lord Hume was paid the entire sum of £200 from the farms of Ettrick Forest promised to him by the king for the construction and repair of the tower of Newark castle.[485] Between 1455 and 1460 a total of £486 was submitted by the chamberlain of royal lands north of the Spey for the repair and reconstruction of Inverness castle.[486] In 1458 the same accountant was allowed 10s for the repair of the prison at Elgin castle.[487] During the reign of James II and in the early years of James III local expenses formed a substantial part of the Ballivi ad Extra's discharge but towards the end of the fifteenth century, most of these miscellaneous expenses tended to disappear from the accounts, leaving only the fees of local office holders. In the accounts of the earldom of Fife, the average annual allowance for local expenses totalled £185 between 1450 and 1460 but during the first decade of the sixteenth century, the average expenditure had fallen to just over £50 annually.[488] Local expenses sustained in the property accounts were numerous and covered a host of items, even the cost of warding Farquhar McIntosh in Dunbar castle in the early sixteenth century required an annual allowance of £20 from the accounts of the grangers of Dunbar.[489]

Most of the above allowances represented disbursements made by the accountant himself or taken up by grantees who possessed a legal title to the farms collected. However, the cash included in many of the items of discharge included in these accounts never actually passed through the hands of the accountant and their inclusion in the accounts proved to represent only paper work. This was principally the result of the extreme conservatism of accounting in Scotland whereby the Ballivi ad Extra's charge tended to remain static in the face of fluctuating returns from royal property. This frigidity in the

---

485. ER, x, 166, 170.

486. ER, vi, 221, 469, 474, 482, 521, 656, vii, 20.

487. ER, vi, 482.

488. See Appendix No.B/2(e)

489 ER, xiii, 17, 188, 309, 468, 541.

accountant's charge was based on the desire on the part of the crown not to accept any diminution of income and also from the fact that auditors tended to base their decisions on the records of past accounts. It is understandable that the Auditors of the Exchequer were keen to resist the leasing of royal property at reduced rates since this not only resulted in the loss of revenue to the crown but it was more than likely that the difference between the gross charge and the stated rent was pocketed by the accountant perhaps with collusion of the lessee involved. Although the existance of a regular charge during the fifteenth century must have eased the amount of routine work associated with the office of Ballivi ad Extra it provided the accounts with a slightly unrealistic appearance.

Diminutions of rent and temporary fluctuations were recorded within the accountant's discharge. In 1486 the chamberlain of Moray recorded a loss of £3 in the farm of the lands of Cauldcoats since the charge contained the customary return of £4 but the lands were let annually for only £1 since they had been wasted by floods.[490] The crown was engaged in a lengthy struggle to extract the maximum from the royal property within the earldom of Mar. In the 1455 account of the chamberlain of Mar an allowance of £56-19-2 was recorded for lands within Strathdee and Cromar in waste which represented a quarter of the gross farm of £203-3-4 charged to the accountant.[491] By 1458 a waste allowance had fallen to £20-4-2 but an additional allowance of £48-12s was recorded as an overcharge to the chamberlain.[492] The overcharge, varying in size, continued in the Mar accounts during the 1460s and in 1471 it was stated that although the chamberlain's charge recorded an annual farm of £203-3-4 for the lands of Strathdee and Cromar, the actual rent amounted to only £149-16s thus registering a loss to the crown of £53-7-4.[493] By 1484, following a gap in the

---

490. ER, ix, 247.

491. ER, vi, 72.

492. ER, vi, 438.

493. ER, viii, 78.

Mar accounts, the gross charge had risen to £220-10s but Alexander Gordon of Midmar, received a lifegrant of the lease at the 'old farm ... contained in the ancient rental before the late John Stewart, earl of Mar raised the farms', stated to amount to the previous gross charge of £203-3-4, thus incurring a further annual allowance of £17-16-8.[494] The over optimistic and rather unrealistic nature of the gross charge resulted in annual allowances for revenue loss in the accounts.

Allowances for waste normally meant that the lands involved were either uninhabited or left unlet or else that they had been ravaged in some way. In 1465 the farm of Cambuskist was allowed to David Scrimgeour, chamberlain of the king's property north of the Tay, since the lands had not been leased during the time of that account.[495] Because of the conservative nature of the Ballivi ad Extra accounts, it was not uncommmon for allowances for waste to continue to be recorded in the accountant's discharge long after the reason for the concession had diminished. In 1486 an inquiry was ordered by the auditors into the waste of the lands within the earldom of Ross, which amounted to a loss of £152-1-10 and a large quantity of grain and livestock for the four years of the account.[496] In 1479 William Gordon of Dungulas was instructed either to lease or occupy the lands of Urquhart and Glenmoriston which had been declared waste in his account to the loss of £33-6-8 since no further allowance was to be permitted for waste.[497] Allowances for waste were also considered for royal property which had been devastated. Between 11 December 1476 and 15 July 1480 the farmer of Arran, sir John Colquhoun of Luss was forced to compound with the lords of the Council on account of the devastation of the island by certain

---

494. ER, ix, 385-6, 525. Sir Alexander Gordon was still alive in 1497 but had died before March 1502-3. ER, xi, 20, xii, 296.

495. ER, vii, 353.

496. ER, ix, 404.

497. ER, viii, 601; ix, 37.

Islesmen, whereby £113-6-8 was submitted to the comptroller instead of £199-5-4 as recorded in the charge,[498] while for the two years prior to the account of 1487, the chamberlain of Fife received an allowance of £16 for the farms of the lands and mill of Balkerose, wasted by the private feud between the lairds of Ardros and Kelly.[499]

The gross charge of property accounts, especially in the early part of the fifteenth century, took no cognizance of the loss of revenue from estates which had been arbitrarily occupied by neighbouring landowners. Following an inquiry into the identity of the occupier of the royal property of Abergeldy in Aberdeenshire, the estate was stated in 1449 to be in the possession of the earl of Huntly. The earl seems to have remained in possession of the lands in question to the annual loss of £10 to the crown, although after 1469 no further allowance for the occupation was recorded.[500] Despite this omission, it would appear that, although still charged to the chamberlain of Mar and later to that of Kintore, the farms from Abergeldy never reached the crown, for in 1484 it was stated the lands were in the hands of Alexander Gordon through royal charter and in 1501 Alexander Gordon of Midmar was confirmed in the lands of Abergeldy and Estoun.[501] The lands of Bochrum and Kinninmond, charged to the local accountant at £10 annually, represented another portion of royal property lost to baronial encroachment. Occupied by the earl of Huntly from 1449 until 1456,[502] the lands were claimed by John, earl of Atholl in 1460,[503]

---

498. ER, viii, 488, ix, 27-8. In the first three terms 40 marks was paid to the comptroller and in the final two years the payment was rasied to 50 marks and finally to £40.

499. ER, iv, 513.

500. ER, v, 256, 376, vii, 651. The lands of Abergeldy were recorded as not having been charged to John Fife in his account of royal property within the shire of Aberdeen during the 1440s but in 1450 they were entered in the charge of the chamberlain of Mar. ER, v, 461.

501. ER, ix, 263. RMS, ii, 2613. The allowance ceased to be recorded in the Exchequer Rolls after 1469 but the annual farm of £10 probably formed part of the accountant's arrears.

502. ER, v, 367, 654, vi, 768, 264.

503. ER, vii, 129, 561.

who asserted that they formed part of the grant of Balvany made to him in 1460,[504] and, although Atholl continued to divert the rents into his own pocket, it was not until 1505 that John, earl of Atholl received a hereditary gift of the lands from the crown and all claim to past farms was finally abandoned by the king.[505]

However, there were examples of even more overt plundering of the revenues derived from the royal demesne. In 1458 Celestine of the Isles occupied lands in the Black Isle, valued at 20 marks, beyond those assigned to him as keeper of the royal castle in that area.[506] Between 1460 and 1462 a total of £771 in revenue from royal property in Petty, Brackley, the Black Isle, Bonnoch, Strathdean, [illegible] and other lands in Inverness-shire were raised by the earl of Ross and Celestine of the Isles without any royal mandate.[507] Although John, earl of Ross also seems to have plundered the island of Bute in the 1460s there is no evidence of the effect in the accounts,[508] but such devastating incursions by Ross and his pillaging of royal revenue in the north must have convinced James III of the need to act against this uncontrollable magnate. Even smaller men were not averse to defrauding the crown of its revenue; in 1452 Andrew Glaster refused to pay £3-6-8 of the farms of the lands of Latheris while in the previous year John Verty, a factor of Thomas Ogilvy deforced the mair of Brechin 10 marks of the farms of Cortachy.[509]

In addition, the 'Ballivi ad Extra' was not always responsible for the collection of all the farms recorded in his charge. Although such delegations of authority for the collection of royal income from certain property sources

---

504. RMS, ii, 750. There was no mention of these lands in the charter recorded in the Register of the Great Seal.

505. ER, xii, 293,

506. ER, vi, 473.

507. ER, vii, 20, 235.

508. APS, ii, 109.

509. ER, v, 450, 520.

may have eased many administrative problems, it was not always a profitable expedient. From Whitsun 1452 until 1455 the farms of the lands of Lethame, Mersington, Gredane and certain castlewards were gathered by David Chirnside, constituted a special receiver by the crown under privy seal letters, but Chirnside seems to have died around the same time and in 1457 it was stated that payment of the outstanding sum of £165-9s had not been forthcoming to the comptroller and since no goods were available for poinding the crown was forced to resort to poinding the lands of Chirnside's heirs when they came of age.[510] During the second half of the fifteenth century, gaps in the accounts of a specific area might mean that that particular roll has been lost or that the farms had been appropriated. In 1464 Robert Mure accounted for the farms of the earldom of Menteith and the lordship of Stirlingshire, but only for the Martinmas term, for the Whitsun term William Edmonstone of Duntreith and Gilbert, lord Kennedy were constituted receivers of the rents from Menteith and Stirlingshire respectively.[511] Although Edmonstone subsequently accounted for his intromission, there is no evidence that Kennedy had ever done so and from June 1464 James Shaw of Sauchie was appointed chamberlain for Stirlingshire.[512]

I. FINANCIAL EFFICIENCY OF THE BALLIVI AD EXTRA AND THE PROBLEM OF ARREARS

But, how efficient were the Ballivi ad Extra? It is, in many ways, difficult to dig beneath the rigidity of the Exchequer Rolls and discover the actual methods by which Ballivi ad Extra operated, the extent of corruption and connivance and even to ascertain whether the entries recorded in the rolls represented real receipts or payments or merely paper work. In fact, a

---

510. ER, vi, 58-9, 255-6, 334.

511. ER, vii, 247.

512. ER, vii, 343, 483.

thought expounded by R. R. Davies concerning English baronial accounts in the later Middle Ages, namely that 'one might begin to wonder whether Mediaeval account rolls are not a sustained exercise in deliberate deception and whether the Mediaeval baron let alone the modern historian, could ever arrive at a safe estimation of his income',[513] might well equally apply to the accounts of the Scottish kings during the same period. As mentioned above, the cash included in many of the allowances detailed in the accountant's discharge did not actually pass through his hands but tended to denote lands from which the crown derived no financial benefit, either through waste, legal and illegal occupation or assignation.

The most obvious indication of an accountant's efficiency and ability was reflected in the size and persistance of his arrears totals. However, the building up of large arrears by many Ballivi ad Extra was a feature of fifteenth century landed accounts. For instance, by 1490 the arrears from the accounts of the rangers of the ward of Ettrick stood at a total of £2,554 and a quantity of livestock,[514] while by 1514 the accountant responsible for the lands of Kintore, Coull, Oneill and others, with a gross annual farm of only £84-6-8, had amassed arrears of over £1,105 with substantial quantities of grain livestock.[515] Responsibility for accounting arrears was a personal liability and could not be transferred to the next occupant of the office. In 1489 Patrick Hepburn of Beynstone, steward chamberlain of the earldom of Fife, was not charged with £655-17s, the rest of the last account of Thomas Simpson as chamberlain in 1488, since the latter was to be charged with the outstanding sum in his account as comptroller in May 1490.[516] Thus, it is obvious that

---

513. Davies, 'Baronial Accounts, Income and Arrears in the Later Middle Ages', Econ H.R., 2nd series, xxi, 212.

514. ER, x, 173.

515. ER, xiv, 27.

516. ER, x, 118.

the personal responsibility of a royal fiscal official for the arrears from one account could easily be transferred to another for which he was also accountable.

Arrears can be divided into two types, temporary and irretrievable. Concerning the former, the temporary accumulation of arrears did not represent a serious problem and tended to reflect the sluggishness of the accounting procedure. Such totals might result from a delay in the granting of an allowance to the accountant by the Auditors of the Exchequer or the fact that the Ballivi ad Extra still retained part of his charge in his own hands at the time of the audit either because he has not as yet paid it over to whoever it was due or else he retained the cash in anticipation of a formidable item of expenditure in the following year. It was not uncommon for an accountant to find an allowance delayed by the auditors if it was in any way dubious or contrary to the king's interests. In his three term account of 27 January 1499-1500, master Cuthbert Baillie, Chamberlain of Galloway, was charged with £4, the farm of the lands of Pollincre but he was to receive no allowance for the cash involved until a decision had been reached as to the claim of Robert Charteris of Amisfield to the possession of the lands, but in his arrears account of 1501, the sum was subsequently allowed to the accountant. It was noted in the 1502 account of the chamberlain of Galloway that Charteris held the lands through a royal charter granted under the great seal, dated 6 August 1501.[517] There are numerous examples of these short term difficulties. In 1505 the chamberlain of Fife, the late David Beaton of Creich recorded a cash rest of £440-5-8 at the foot of his account, which had only been accumulated

---

517. ER, xi, 189, 337 xii, 17. ADC. ii, 446, 459. RMS, ii, 1714, 2592. On 3 December 1500 the lords of the Council considering Charteris's claim to the lands of Pollincre gave no definate decision but submitted the matter to the kings will. The 1501 charter of gift to Charteris confirmed an earlier charter of James III, granted during the final months before Sauchieburn and probably in reward for past and future services against the rebels.

during the year of the account, by the next account, that of James Beaton, Abbot of Dunfermline, a relative of the late accountant who was therefore obliged to take over his debt, the rest had declined to £84-3-5 and in 1507 an 'eque' or balance was achieved.[518] From these accounts, it would appear that temporary insolvency was the result of revenue charged to the accountant but not actually collected by the time of the audit and it was only in later accounts that payment from these sources could be made to the comptroller or allowance which had not always been sought or granted during the year of the original account. Also the existance of large temporary arrears was often the result of the accountant retaining substantial sums in his own possession from year to year as a working balance.

A more serious problem was presented by the irretrievable arrears. Although such accumulations reflected badly on the honesty and efficiency of the Ballivi ad Extra, such explanations did not always represent the entire cause. Recurring arrears often revealed a significant gulf between the potential income, namely the accountant's charge, and the actual yield of a particular portion of royal property. Decayed rent, waste and lands left unlet, especially in regions particularly vulnerable to devastation and pillaging, arbitrary intromission with royal farms, illegal occupation and a host of other deductions affected the gross revenue, for which the Ballivi ad Extra was liable, but which he had little chance of honouring. The rigidity of the accountant's charge was largely responsible for the substantial arrears totals which appeared at the foot of many accounts. However, between the constant change of accountants and inclusion of temporary arrears, it is often difficult to detect the existance of permenant deficits. The accounts of the receiver of royal farms from Kintore, Coull and Oneil between 1472 and 1514 provided an excellent example. The deficit rose steadily from £15 in 1473 to £165-8-8 by 1484, £713-1/- by 1494,

---

518. ER Xii, 277-81, 440-4, 520-4.

£926-17-4 by 1505 and finally to £1,105-12/- by 1514.[519] Between 1496 and 1502 Alexander, Lord Hume, chamberlain of the Earldom of March, accumulated a rest of £1,405, on the surface a dramatic deficit but, in reality, a substantial proportion of this figure represented only temporary arrears since in the 1503 account, a host of allowances for previous years took care of a large portion of the outstanding cash and the remainder, totalling £150-15-5 probably represented the more permanent type of arrears.[520]

The approach of the crown and the Auditors of the Exchequer to the question of arrears was one of persistance. Central authority was determined that these arrears totals should not be quietly ignored but that every effort should be made to retrieve all, or, at worst, a substantial proportion of these rests. On their departure from the office of Ballivi ad Extra, many officials, who had not achieved a satisfactory balance, submitted an account of their arrears at subsequent Exchequers in order to clear their outstanding debts. At his dismissal on 12 April 1497, the account of James Lindsay, Chamberlain of Galloway, recorded a rest of £1,377.10.6.[521] In 1502 his son, Michael Lindsay of Fairgarth accounted at the Exchequer for his father's arrears, in which a total of £479-19-8 was allowed to Lindsay and a further £791-19-10 was excluded from his responsibility since that sum represented the 1494 rest of Adam Mure, a former Chamberlain of Galloway, leaving only £105-11/- still outstanding.[522] Two years later, the remaining £105 was accounted for, consisting, apart from £41-10/- to the comptroller, mostly of fictitious revenue for which the accountant was only

---

519. ER, viii, 156, ix, 263, x, 413, xii, 293, xiv, 27.
520. ER, xii, 116-9.
521. ER, xi, 108
522. ER, xii, 62-5. Of the £791-19-10, £50 was stated as having been paid by Mure from the farms and grassums of Galloway, and a record of this was included in the 1496 accounts of Galloway. The arrears of Mure are mentioned again in 1504 but there is no record of their settlement ER, xii, 229

now able to gain an allowance, leaving a rest of only £5-11/-.[523] Although fictitious revenues represented a steady loss of income to the crown and although the accountant was responsible for all the farms recorded in his charge, central officials were frequently compelled to accept the situation and deal leniently with Ballivi ad Extra faced with irretrievable arrears.

The royal pardon or settlement by composition were employed by the crown in cases of obvious hardship where it was impossible to balance an account or as a mark of special favour. In the first decade of the sixteenth century, Alexander, Lord Hume benefitted from royal leniency on two occasions. From the 1503 accounts of the earldom of March and Ettrick Forest, Lord Hume was responsible for a total rest of £731-19-7 and 372 salmon and in order to clear his accounts the latter compounded with the King for £454 payable to the comptroller [524] and four years later the arrears of Lord Hume, now dead, standing at £584-10-6 from the farms of March, were totally remitted by the crown.[525] Similarly in 1501 William, Lord Ruthven, presented an account of his arrears as chamberlain of Methven in 1484 and, at the foot of this account, lord Ruthven compounded with the King and the auditors for the rest of £59-16-8 whereby he paid £30 to the comptroller, John Stirling.[526] Such a policy revealed a mixture of compasion and realism, an attempt by the crown to cut its losses and gain the best terms available for outstanding revenue.

On the other hand, the crown was anxious to avoid the excuse of irretrievable arrears being used as a cover for inefficiency and corruption.

---

523. ER, xii, 228-230.
524. ER, xii, 115, 119
525. ER, xii, 528. This settlement probably formed part of the composition of £950 payable to the treasurer by Alexander, lord Hume, for infeftment to his lands, his reliefs, and remission of arrears remaining from the accounts of himself and his father. TA, iii, 237.
526. ER, xi, 337-8.

Unfortunately the arrears of many Ballivi and Extra disappeared from record without trace. Between 1479 and his death in 1508, Thomas Wardroper accounted as chamberlain of Kinclaven and other royal property in Perthshire, steadily accumulating a rest which totalled £1,268-7s, 53 marts and 1,200 salmon, for which sum his heirs and executors were summoned to make a settlement but there is no further hint as to any arrangement with the crown.[527] Although it is difficult to believe that the crown would have been prepared to waive this debt completely, the manner in which the rest had steadily enlarged during the thirty years suggested that a substantial proportion was composed of irretrievable arrears from which the crown would have succeeded in extracting only a small fraction. In 1518 Andrew Wardroper, chamberlain of the same property compounded for a large portion of his arrears and the outstanding sum of £20 and 25 marts was remitted to Wardroper on account of his poverty and for the maintenance of his offspring.[528] However, persistant refusal by a departed accountant to come to terms with the crown forced the latter, in order to derive some financial benefit from the arrears, to poind the goods and the lands of the offending official. In 1474, only a year after his final account as chamberlain of Kinclaven, Alexander Wardroper of Gorys was to suffer such a fate for his reluctance to settle his debt of £84-6-8, 96 salmon and 5 marts. This particular entry also revealed a further method employed by many Ballivi ad Extra in order to defraud crown. At the foot of Wardroper's 1473 account as chamberlain, the rest totalled only £30-10s with the same total of salmon and marts, but it was later added, possibly at the instigation of the auditors, that a further £53-16-8 was to

---

527. ER, ix, 8, xiii, 170. Thomas Wardroper entered the office of Chamberlain of Kinclaven in 1473. ER, viii, 236. In 1479 he compounded for his arrears of £121-8-11, composed partly of grassums and partly of farms of land considered to be in waste, whereby he submitted £40 to the comptroller. ER, viii, 609. Mention is made of Wardroper's arrears in 1512 but thereafter the entry is no longer recorded in the rolls. ER, xiii, 474.

528. ER, xiv, 205. Of the arrears of £20 , half was paid to the comptroller as the composition payment and the remainder remitted.

be charged to the accountant which he had conveniently omitted to include in the present account but with which he would be charged in the future.[529] Omissions of this nature were frequent and if not discovered by the auditors would have excluded the accountant of responsibility for the sums involved. Although poinding was repeatedly threatened in the Exchequer Rolls, actual evidence of this expedient being employed is more difficult to discover. However, following the arrears account of Sir William Scott of Balwery, the former chamberlain of Fife, in 1501 a rest of £100-7-5, 7 chalders of corn, 25 chalders of barley, 1 chalder of malt, 9 chalders of oats was still outstanding[530] and in order to settle the debt, on 22 November 1504, the lands of Kilgour, belonging to Scott, were apprized by the sheriff of Fife for a debt of 340 marks by the chamberlain to the crown, and were sold to Andrew Ayton, captain of Stirling castle.[531] Under this arrangement the crown received payment of the debt from Ayton leaving the latter and the original debtor to settle the issue. Fairly severe expedients were employed by the crown to ensure prompt and full payment of outstanding sums. On 19 July 1503 Henry, lord Sinclair was bound to pay the comptroller, John Stirling, the sum of £205-5-4 for the farms of Orkney within the next eight days under the pain of doubling the amount and on 7 September, the same year, Alexander, lord Hume was similarly encouraged to submit £154 before next Martinmas under a similar penalty.[532] In 1485, Thomas Inglis, a factor under the bishop of Orkney, who was responsible for half the lease of the lordships of Orkney and Shetland, was arrested for his failure to settle a debt of £202-8-6, the rest at the foot of his 1481 account.[532]

---

529. ER, viii, 168, 236.
530. ER, xi, 304-7.
531. RMS, ii, 2806. Scott retained the right of regress on repayment of the sum involved to Ayton.
532. ADC, xiv, 178, f 186.
533. ER, ix, 307.

In addition, the auditors were also anxious to ensure that what had been allowed to the Ballivi ad Extra in his accounts had actually been paid to the proper person, as recorded in the rolls. On 25 January 1484-5, James Dunbar of Cumnock, chamberlain of Ross, was summoned before the Lords Auditors for withholding 100 marks of farms of the last Whitsun term from property in Ross which had been conceded to Elizabeth, countess of Ross, for which he had received an allowance in his accounts.[534] In the 1490 account of Thomas Wardroper, chamberlain of Kinclaven, an allowance of £62 was sanctioned for the part payment of a pension of £200 payable to sir James Douglas but on 12 February 1489-90 the chamberlain was accused of withholding £47-13-4 of the pension from the farms of Glenlyon, Deschier and Toyer, Strathbran and Apnadull for the previous term of Martinmas and on his failure to appear before the Lords Auditors on that date Wardroper was ordered to be distrained for the outstanding sum and if any of the cash was proved to be in the hands of the tenants, he was given power to distrain them.[535] Although occasionally an accountant was overexpended for the year's account, the outstanding sum was allowed in the following account.[536]

Although it was the responsibility of the Ballivi ad Extra to extract the full farms and grassum from the various royal tenants under his charge, the former was presented with the power of distraint in order to perform his task more efficiently. Following his account as chamberlain of Kilmarnock in 1491, Alexander Boyd was frequently summoned for his rest of £211-14s but the royal courts backed his attempts to retrieve part of that debt from his own reluctant debtors, for, on 9 March 1502-3 he pursued

---

534. ADC, ii, 100[x]. ER, ix, 403-4. Dunbar seems to have made a habit of this, for on 6 December 1494, he was again summoned for the same crime. ADA, 191.

535. ADA, 133-4. ER, x, 183.

536. ER, vi, 82, 326.

Cuthbert Lyne before the Lords of the Council for £23 as the rest of farms and duties from royal property within the lordship of Kilmarnock.[537]

Whether through inability to achieve a balance or 'eque' or through an attempt to conceal evidence of corruption, many accountants seem to have been extremely reluctant to render full account at the Exchequer. Although most of the Ballivi ad Extra in central Scotland tended to audit their account at fairly regular intervals, those on the periphery were far more lax in their attendance at the annual Exchequer. Between 1496 and 1505 John, lord Kennedy, chamberlain of Carrick accounted only twice at the Exchequer, in 1501 for the previous five years and in 1505 for four years.[538] Between 1487 and 1498 no account was rendered by the chamberlain of Petty and Brackly, an omission which was financially detrimental to the crown. Although Alexander Farquharson was able to render some sort of account for five years from Martinmas 1492 the auditors were ignorant of the identity of the intromitters for the period between 1487 and 1492. Of the gross potential of the lands, at £3,495-5s, 134 marts and the same number of sheep, plus an additional £218-7-5, the rest of George, earl of Huntly from account of 1486, £566-13-4 was allowed from the farms of Urquhart and Glenmoriston for the fee of the earl of Huntly for 8½ years, a further £316-13-4 from Glenmoriston on account of waste for 9½ years, and £464-6-8 was transmitted to various comptrollers from 1492 but the remainder was irretrievably lost to the crown.[539] Thus the danger of not enforcing regular accounts was evident.

As a result of the accumulation of both temporary and permanent arrears and through the efforts of royal officers and other interested

---

537. ADC, xiii, f 117, ER, x, 269, xi, 196.
538. ER, xi, 334, xii, 311.
539. ER, xi, 106-7, 185-6.

parties to defraud the crown each year witnessed the declaration of substantial balances at the foot of property accounts. In the twenty four Ballivi ad Extra accounts audited in 1506, a total of £5,951-11-9, 24 chalders of wheat, 80 chalders of barley, 249 chalders of oats, 353 marts and 37 chalders of meal was thus recorded as arrears, with only five accountants achieving an 'eque' in both cash and kind.[540]

Statements were issued condemning laxity in the auditing of accounts. In 14 July 1503 a letter of James IV mentioned that the Auditors of the Exchequer 'has remainit and sittin in this toune attour the latter day of the chekkar apoin the comptis' of chamberlains, farmers and a host of other local officials 'that aw compt to our chekkar, nevartheless the maste part of the said officaris aucht compt are nocht comparis and an other part compeir and has past away unendit the comptis and comptempuouslly had dissobeyt nocht dredond the panis contenit in our preceptis and lettrez past apoin thame.' In response to the gravity of the situation, royal accountants were instructed to appear at the Exchequer on the following Monday with a continuation of days to present their accounts and 'to red and end the sammyn finaly' and those that failed to comply with the terms of the letter were to deprived of their offices and holdings and their goods and lands were to be apprized for 'the hale soumez restand upoun thaim in our rollis, with certification to all that disobbeis this present charge that the panis foresaid salbe execute apoun theim but ony delay or favour.[541] In another letter, the king attempted to compel those who owed 'auld restis' to account for their debts under similar penalties as above.[542] However, despite royal fulminations

---

540. ER, xii, 388-461.

541. ADC, xiv, f 177. The loss of office included those held in heritage and also all leases held by the offender.

542. ADC, xiv, f 180.

and threats, inefficiency, corruption and indebtedness continued to be a feature of property accountants during the later Middle Ages. Although, in general, the Mediaeval Ballivi ad Extra was affected by graft and a lack of purpose, it would also be fair to state that his financial position was exacerbated by the rigidity of the accounting system and the crown's failure to recognise fictitious revenue.

It is only through the detailed analysis of separate Ballivi ad Extra accounts that any indication of the real worth of the particular portion of royal property and efficiency of the accountant can be gained. The conservative and rigid nature of the accounts only serve to hinder such an undertaking. A breakdown of the accounts of certain Ballivi ad Extra revealed that, although certain regions were more susceptible to large deficits than others, there was considerable variation within the same series of accounts. The amount of revenue lost within a specific account was calculated by subtracting the real revenue, that is the cash paid annually by the accountant to the comptroller, from the annual value of the property, which represented the difference between the gross charge for a particular account the total allowances recorded in the discharge. In short, the annual value of a particular piece of royal property was the amount of revenue which the crown was entitled to expect whereas the real revenue represented the cash actually received by the crown through the comptroller. If the total recorded for the annual value of the property coincided with the real revenue total, no revenue was lost and the accountant achieved a balance or 'eque'. In the accounts of royal property in Linlithgowshire between 1472 and 1478 the average annual gross charge amounted to £182, the annual value of the account after the deduction of allowances was £47 of which £46 was paid over to the comptroller as real revenue, representing only a small percentage of unaccountable revenue. But, although the annual gross charge had risen to only £186 in the six years following 1502, the effectiveness of the account had declined dramatically since there was

a large gap between the annual value of the account at £85 and the real revenue at £20.[543] An analysis of three of the larger property accounts during the late Middle Ages presented some interesting insights into the viability of the Mediaeval accounting system. An annual average over two four year periods, namely 1456-60 and 1506-10, of the gross charge, the annual value and the real revenue. In the accounts for the earldom of Fife, during the first period the annual value amounted to exactly half the gross charge at almost £600 but what is significant was the fact that the real revenue did not fall very far short of the former figure, demonstrating a remarkable efficiency on the part of the accountant.[544] In short, tha annual value of a particular piece of royal property was the amount of revenue which the crown was entitled to expect whereas the real revenue represented the cash actually received by the crown through the comptroller. If the total recorded for the annual value of the property coincided with the real revenue total, no revenue was lost and the accountant achieved a balance or 'eque'. The close relation between the annual value and the real revenue totals for Fife during the reigns of James II and III reflected extremely efficient accounting by the various chamberlains but during the reign of James IV the situation deteriorated. Although the real revenue total still amounted to half the gross charge (that is £536 to £905) the allowances total had fallen dramatically, which meant that the annual value of the accounts rose from £292 in the 1450's to £740 in the first decade of the sixteenth century, resulting in the accumulation of fairly extensive arrears. The accounts of Galloway revealed a different

---

543. See Appendix. No. B/2 (g)

544. For details of the whole complex of figures for the accounts of Fife, March and Galloway, see Appendix No. B/2 (e)

	Charge	Value	Real Revenue
1456-60.	£596	£292	£279
1506-10.	£905	£740	£536.

picture for, throughout the period under consideration the real revenue, standing at £249 in the 1450's and £698 in the four years from 1506, remained at around 70% of the annual value of the account, which amounted to £344 in the earlier period and £940 in the later. A feature of these accounts between the two dates was the closing of the gulf between the gross charge and the annual value, revealing a considerable drop in the amount of allowances sought by the Ballivi ad Extra. This steady attrition of revenue made its mark in the arrears totals which remained considerable for Galloway during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, reaching £952 in 1469, £700 in 1485, £1,710 in 1494 and £1,423 in 1510.[545] The earldom of March provided the crown with little real financial reward. Between the two periods both the gross charge and the real revenue totals remained relatively static at £590 and £120 respectively while the actual value of the accounts dropped from £290 in the reign of James II to £128 under James IV. A large annual allowance total, mainly through the extensive hereditary concession of property within the earldom, was the principal cause but it is noticeable that, in the later period, there was little difference between the value of the accounts and the cash submitted to the comptroller. The occasion of large rests, £1,405 in 1502 and £1,356 in 1506, however, represented mostly temporary arrears and were quickly cleared through large allowances in the following accounts.[546]

---

545. See Appendix No.B/2 (i)

	Charge	Value	Real Revenue
1456-60	£ 578	£344	£249
1506-10.	£1,069	£940	£698

546. See Appendix No.B/2 (h)

	Charge	Value	Real Revenue
1456-60.	£592	£290	£121
1506-10	£582	£128	£122

James IV, in his eagerness to extract greater financial returns from his landed property, was anxious to increase the efficiency of his local accountants but through the augmentation of farms during the reign of James IV, most Ballivi ad Extra found themselves responsible for the collection of greater amounts of cash. With the leasing of Ettrick Forest for nine years in 1501 the chamberlain was now charged with rents totalling £2,670-3-3.[547] However, in the early sixteenth century certain accounts were efficiently conducted, between 1501 and 1513 an analysis of the accounts of Ettrick Forest revealed that the annual totals for the value of the accounts and the real revenue were almost identical as were those for the accounts of the feuar of Glencairny between 1505 and 1513.[548] Because the profit, the annual value and the real revenue from the latter accounts were frequently similar, these accounts of Glencairny could be regarded as a prototype for efficient accounting.

Although, on the surface, many accounts appeared to record greater accounting inefficiency and larger losses of revenue during the riegn of James IV, such an accusation must be tempered with a recognition of an alteration in the circumstances during that period. With the augmentation of rent through the introduction of longer leases and feuing under James IV, the pressure on the accountant increased significantly. This was especially true during the few years immediately following the change, for, despite the crown's claim for the full payment of the new terms, many royal tenants resisted the full implications of their new status. The account immediately following the leasing of the forest of Ettrick for nine years in 1501 revealed an allowance of £574 out of a total charge of £2,670 for the lack cattle on the holding and the retention of the old rent levels while £310 remained unaccounted for at the foot of the account.[549] Also, following the

---

547. ER, xi, 457, xii, 31.
548. See Appendix No.B/2 (f)
549. ER, xii, 31-8.

increase in the rental of the property of Strathearn, William Drummond, alias Spicehouse, received an allowance of £16-15/- in 1504 for the previous three terms for lands, charged to the chamberlain at the 'double farm' but which were still leased to Drummond at the old rate.[550] In 1505 the chamberlain of Stirlingshire was charged with the feufarm of the lands of Apnadull, Cambusarnot and Rannach at £60-3-4 but the revenue was immediately allowed in the discharge since the sum had been remitted by the king to the feuar, Robert Menzies of Wemyss.[551] In the 1512 account of the chamberlain of Fife, the first recorded account following the general feuing of the earldom in March 1509-10, a total of £322-16-6 was allowed to the accountant from his arrears from the feufarms charged to him in the previous account (of which there is no surviving record) since the auditors of the Exchequer remitted this sum to the various tenants of the earldom.[552] In addition, many Ballivi ad Extra during the reign of James IV were forced to seek allowances for rents and grassums which had been remitted by the crown to the lessee. The extreme formality of the property accounts was revealed in 1502 when the chamberlain of Strathearn, Patrick Scott, was charged with the newly elevated rent for the property of £668-13-4 only to be allowed £296-3-4 of the gross total in his discharge because the new assessment did not come into operation until after Whitsum.[553] A large portion of the accountants discharge was thus composed to fictitious revenue which never, in fact, passed through the hands of the Ballivi ad Extra.

---

550. ER, xii, 211

551. ER, xii, 299-301.

552. ER, xiii, 431.

553. ER, ii, 50.

J) CONTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY ACCOUNTS

In conclusion, by analysing the property accounts for the final four years of the James, II, III and IV, it is possible to trace the movement of profit gained by the crown from its landed resources. During these three periods, there was a steady rise in the gross annual farms from the royal demesne, from £5,430 in the final years of James II, to £7,248 between 1484-8 and finally £10,475 in the years before Flodden. The increase before 1488 was mainly due to the acquisition of new areas of crown property through forfeiture, inheritance and exchange, but during the reign of James IV the tendancy towards longer leases and feuing was accompanied by a deliberate policy of augmenting the basic rent attached to large areas of royal property.[554] There was a corresponding increase in the gross charge recorded in the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra. In the reign of James II and during the early years of his successor, the Ballivi ad Extra was, in addition to the profits from crown lands, responsible for income from justice ayres, feudal casualties and miscellaneous other items of revenue. In 1457, for instance, the chamberlain of Carrick was charged with feudal incidents to the time of £129.10/-, more than double the farm derived from royal property while in 1460 the chamberlain north of the Dee included in this responsibilities £65 from wardships and £207-11/- from the farms of the property of the vacant bishopric of Moray for the Whitsun term.[555] As the fifteenth century progressed, the gap between the total from royal rents and the gross charge narrowed as many of these sources of revenue disappeared from the property rolls, leaving grassums as the only irregular payment. Grassums, a single year's rent levied at the renewal of every lease, also involved a considerable sums of money. In 1510 William Forbes of Towis, receiver of

---

554. For details see the chapter on leases and feus.

555. ER, vi, 342, 648-9.

Garioch, was charged with grassums of £151-3-4, only £4 short of the annual farm and paid over entirely to the comptroller. But most grassums totals amounted to only a fraction of the annual farm since many estates were either not let or occupied by neighbouring landowners and, in addition, of the sum charged to the accountant, allowances for remission further reduced the actual profit.[556]

However, the most significant figure was represented by the real revenue total, which represented allowances given to the Ballivi ad Extra for cash transmitted to the comptroller. During the period under review, there was a 260% rise in the real revenue derived from crown property from the end of the reign of James II to the final years of James IV; the totals rose from an average of £2,518 annually between 1456 to 1460, to £3,516 between 1484 and 1488 and finally to £6,625 in the four years prior to 1513.[557] A similar trend was reflected in the charge side of the accounts of the comptroller.[558] These figures represented average totals over a defined period but obviously such payments fluctuated considerably according to the number of officials accounting, the existance of temporary arrears and whether grassums were levied that particular year. For, instance, although the average real revenue total between 1508-13 amounted to £6,625, the indivudual year's totals realised £7,354 in 1509, £7,496 in 1510, (there were no surviving accounts from the year 1510-11) and £4,928 in 1512, and £6,717 in 1513.

556. ER, xiii, 338

557. See Appendix No.B/2 (j)

558. See chapter on Comptrollers' Accounts.

K) FARMS IN KIND

Finally, as well as cash farms, the Ballivi ad Extra was also responsible for rents paid in grain and livestock. Although the period following the wars of independance witnessed a gradual monetization of the economy which included an alteration in the type of rent payable to a superior. In the thirteenth century, kind returns almost certainly predominated as the form of payment but from the middle of the fourteenth century submissions in cash became much more normal. However, during the fifteenth century, the majority of property accounts recorded in the Exchequer Rolls revealed that, although cash returns formed the bulk of the income payable to the crown, a varying proportion of the rents were still paid in kind. The continued appearance of grain and livestock 'reddendos' in many late Mediaeval leases was due not so much to the shortage of coin nor the poverty of Scotland, but more to the conservatism of the Scottish financial system and the crown's eagerness to preserve a steady supply of foodstuffs for the household to offset the worst affects of bad harvests. The 1502 lease of the lands of Auchtermuchty and others within the earldom of Fife stated that the tenants were to submit an annual rent of 6 chalders of oats or 4/- for every boll according to the dictates of the comptroller.[559] The gross kind farm from the royal demesne tended to remain fairly static in amount during the fifteenth century, in 1487 it stood at 138 chalders of wheat, 108 chalders of oats, 100 chalders of meal, 215 chalders of barley or bere, 386 marts of various types, 2479 poultry and 2 lasts and 336 salmon while in 1501 the total stood at 110 chalders of wheat, 151 chalders of oats, 59 chalders of meal, 249 chalders of barley or bere, 379 marts, 91 dozen poultry and 13 lasts and 432 salmon.[560]

---

559. ER, xii, 619

560. See Appendix No.B/2 (b)

The amount of grain and livestock which actually found its way to the king's household probably formed a high proportion of the gross receipt, but many Ballivi ad Extra accounts failed to record the destiny of the kind receipts from the region in question. In 1487, at the foot of the cash account of the chamberlain of Fife it was stated that 'the grain was to be allowed below', but no such document was forthcoming. In the same year, of the 25 chalders, 8 bolls of wheat charged to the chamberlain of Moray, 17 chalders contributed to the expenses of the royal household and a further 2 chalders was delivered to George Robinson, the comptroller.[561] In 1507, for instance, of the 138 chalders of wheat, 281 chalders of barley or beer, 139 chalders of oats, 74 chalders of meal, 10 lasts, 6 barrels of salmon and 419 marts which were charged to the various Ballivi ad Extra from areas of crown property, the amount of grain and livestock which eventually found its way to the royal household consisted of 104 chalders of wheat, 179 chalders of barley or beer, 56 chalders of oats, 6 lasts of salmon and 139 marts.[562] In addition, £760 was also transmitted to the comptroller through the commutation of kind farms into cash. Between 1484 and 1487 the gross kind charge of farms from the lordship of Stirlingshire remained fixed at 9 chalders of wheat, 7 chalders of barley, 17 chalders, 8 bolls of beer, 10 chalders, 12 bolls of meal and 4 chalders of oats but the amount of grain which was set aside for royal consumption also tended to remain fairly static annually, averaging 7 chalders, 15 bolls of wheat, 20 chalders, 3 bolls of barley and beer, £15 in cash through the commutation of the meal farm.[563]

However, during the fifteenth century, the tendancy was towards the commutation of many of the existing kind farms. In the early fourteenth century, the barony of Bothkennar was leased for the rent of 20 chalders

---

561. ER, ix, 500-1.

562. ER, xii, 483-590

563. ER, ix, 248-252, 324-8, 354-6, 481-6.

of wheat and 12 chalders of meal but by the mid fifteenth century, the 'reddendo' had altered to £70 in cash and 10 chalders, 12 bolls of meal, the latter later commuted to 10 chalders, 10 bolls of barley.[564] In 1461 it was related that Murdochcairny in Fife was leased for a rent of 20 marks although 'it used to be set in the old rental' for £9 in cash and 2 chalders, 4 bolls of wheat, 2 chalders, 13 bolls of beer and that the commutation of the rent from grain to cash was occasioned by the poverty of the tenants.[565] In the 1481 account of James Shaw of Sauchie, chamberlain of Stirlingshire, the following kind farms were 'sold' by the accountant, 7 chalders, 8 bolls of wheat for £91-12/-, 14 chalders of beer for £110, 5 chalders, 7 bolls of barley for £41, 5 chalders of meal for £26-13-4 and 4 chalders of oats for £12-16s, which cash was subsequently handed over to the comptroller. Because this arrangement was a purely temporary arrangement, it is likely that, in time of shortage such as 1480-1, the accountant was encouraged to accept the current cash equivalent of these kind farms as the tenants were unwilling and indeed, unable to pay the normal grain rent. The total effect of the widespread commutation of kind farms during that year was the transmission of additional cash totalling £1,877 to the comptroller.[566] However, in 1484 commutation was greatly reduced and only £279 was transmitted to the comptroller from various settlements.[567] Apart from alterations in the composition of the king's rentals, there was also a strong move to steadily monetize many of the property accounts. In certain accounts, the Ballivi ad Extra were charged not with the normal grain farm but the cash equivalent through sale. In 1451, Thomas Tawse, chamberlain of Menteith, was charged with £20 through the sale of 6 chalders of meal,

---

564. ER, i, 297-8, 576, vi, 324, ix, 2, xiii, 564.
565. ER, vii, 104.
566, ER, ix, 163-196.
567. ER, ix, 233-281.

part of the grain farm from the lands of Bothkennar.[568] The leasee of Orkney and Shetland was responsible to the crown for a farm of £366-13-4 in cash but the actual farms paid by the various tenants comprised of £120 in specie, 50 chalders of Barley and 120 salted marts sold by the accountant[569] while in the early sixteenth century, the grange of Dunbar was leased to Andrew, bishop of Moray for a cash 'reddendo' of £366-13-4, derived from the sale of 30 chalders of wheat, 30 chalders of barley and 600 rabbits.[570] These commutations took place outside the framework of the accounts, but it was also common in the latter part of the fifteenth century to record the sale of kind farms even within the accountant's discharge. In 1487, for instance, 10 chalders, 8 bolls of meal, charged to the chamberlain of Galloway, were sold to himself for £70 and a further 5 chalders from the grange of Spot were sold to John Murray for 50 marks, both sums, were then transmitted to the comptroller, George Robinson.[571] In that year, the fiscal result of similar commutations of kind farms amounted to a total of £179-16-8 paid over to the comptroller and in 1510 this arrangement realised almost £300 to the comptroller.[572] The extent of such arrangements varied according to the standard of the harvest and the resulting demand for grain, but from the latter part of the reign of James III settlements of this type were increasingly recorded in the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra.

In general, grain and livestock allowances, recorded in the discharge side of the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra, were, in many cases, complementary to the cash allowances, since assignations, liferent

---

568. ER, v, 476.
569. ER, viii, 614.
570. RSS, i, 1534. ER, xiii, 17, 187, 308, 467, 540. On 18 April, 1501, the grange was leased to sir Andrew Wood of Largo for a kind 'reddendo'. RSS, i, 672.
571. ER, ix, 463-4.
572. See Appendix No.B/2 (b)

grants, hereditary concessions and allowances for waste and dubious occupation of a portion of property, involved the loss of both cash and kind farms. The conversion of short leases into feus (or leases of longer duration) during the reign of James IV tended to accelerate the movement towards the monetization of the accounts. Although the chamberlain of Linlithgow was charged with £25-6-8, 1 chalder of barley and 2 chalders of oats for the farm of the lands of Kingscavil, the feu charter specifically stated that the 'reddendo' amounted to £25 annually in cash and so the accountant was forced to seek an annual allowance for the grain recorded in the charge.[573] Not unnaturally, grain farms were more susceptible to the ravages of natural elements than those paid in cash. In 1463 8 bolls of wheat were allowed to the chamberlain of Fife through the destruction of the cereal by rats and in 1510 1 chalder of oats to the tenants of Cache was remitted annually to them as theirs had been destroyed by royal game.[574] Doubtless, such assertions could be employed by accountants as a means of defrauding the corwn. In 1487 James Douglas, chamberlain of Moray, received an allowance for the delivery of 5 chalders of barley to Alexander Duncan through the mandate of the comptroller and Duncan had confessed at the audit to having received the barley but apparently the comptroller was not yet in receipt of the grain. Alexander Duncan had asserted that the barley had perished but the auditors ordered an inquiry into the affair by the comptroller and if it could be proved that the loss was not the fault of Alexander but through a strom at sea or some other natural cause, the 5 chalders was to be allowed to the comptroller.[575] Also, an allowance of 5 chalders of malt

---

573. RMS, ii, 2456. ER, xi, 169, xiii, 278-9.

574. ER, vii, 200, xii, 291.

575. ER, ix, 501-2. However, whatever the findings, the allowance to the chamberlain was assured by Duncan's confession of receipt.

was made during the 1480's for the poverty of the husbandmen of Tillicoultry [515] and discounts of one boll in every chalder were frequently permitted for charity and 'inlaik' or deficiency in the gross receipt.[577]

In conclusion, following the return of James I from captivity in England in 1424, there was a very definite change of attitude on the part of the crown towards property which had, for one reason or another, fallen into royal hands. James I was desperately eager to augment the wealth of the crown in order to raise the position and power of the Scottish monarchy. The weakness of the Scottish crown during the fourteenth century was partly due to the extreme poverty of that insitution, a fact which James I was determined to alter. Many avenues were exploited to bring more cash into the royal coffers, many pensions were revoked, customs levies were put on hitherto uncustomed commodities, a substantial portion of the returns from taxation was diverted for royal use, and it was decided to retain in royal hands many of the landed estates which periodically came into the crown's possession, the profits from which were to make a substantial and permanent contribution towards the cost of government. Although the demands of patronage were not completely submerged, the motivation behind the steady accumulation of landed property in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries was undoubtedly fiscal. This new attitude towards the potential of property was initiated by James I in 1424-5 with the forfeiture of the house of Albany and the permanent acquisition of their estates and continued by his successors. James I made a substantial contribution to the landed wealth of the crown with the acquisition fo the earldoms of Menteith and Fife and other estates from the duke of Albany and the

---

576. ER, ix, 5, 95, 251, 327, 485.

577. ER, ix, 54, 55, 95, 100, 109, 124.

earldoms of Mar, March and Strathearn (although the latter was temporarily granted to Walter, earl Atholl). Following this example, later kings widened the area of the royal demesne through the forfeiture of many of the leading baronial families, the earl of Atholl and the Douglas faction during the reign of James II, lord Boyd, the earls of Arran and Ross and Alexander, duke of Albany in the reign of James III and the lord of the Isles under James IV. Although property was also acquired through the failure of noble houses and exchange, forfeiture provided the crown with its largest stock of property. Despite the fact that royal relatives, crown servants and members of the aristocracy looked to the crown as the main source of patronage, after 1424 the crown was determined to reduce the scope and effect of royal patronage in order that more cash was available for the expenses of government. James I brought to an end the wanton alienation of earldoms, lordships and baronies which came into royal hands. In subsequent reigns hereditary concessions of royal property, liferent grants and pensions were under periodic review by the auditors of the Exchequer in order to ensure that royal patronage was not allowed to greatly affect the level of income expected from the royal demesne. Although the crown was in a position to determine the extent of patronage to royal servants, magnates and those in favour, nevertheless the king was expected to provide handsomely for his relations. There can be little doubt that after 1424 the crown was anxious that the royal demesne should yield sufficient funds to make an effective contribution to government expenses. During the reigns of James III and IV considerable efforts were undertaken by the royal courts and auditors to ensure that areas of the royal demesne were not dissipated illegally to private individuals. Various technicalities were employed to facilitate the revocation of various types of grants based on crown property, principally the periodic checks undertaken by the royal auditors on all such concessions and the utilization of such excuses as grants gifted during the king's minority which were in theory annulled at the king's

revocation, those hereditary concessions which were associated with the annexed estates of the crown and grant titles which were either defective or for which there was no written evidence. In addition, during the second half of the fifteenth century the crown was at pains to increase the efficiency and honest of its landed revenue collectors and to reduce the amount of revenue lost in arrears and fraud. Also, by augmenting the level of rents attached to many areas of the royal demesne following the introduction of longer leases and feuing, it is obvious that the crown regarded its landed possessions as a vital and expolitable source of cash. Like Edward IV in England, James I reformed the financial administration in order to exploit fully the fiscal returns which were to be derived from the royal demesne. Although, before 1424, certain portions of royal property was administered locally by the Ballivi ad Extra, this office was greatly extended in importance as the area of crown property expanded. Also, in the same way as Edward IV introduced the chamber as the principal central financial office to cope with the augmented income from property, in 1424 James I introduced the office of comptroller in place of the chamberlain to collect and account for the net revenue received on the crown's behalf from the local landed accountants. From the above evidence, it is obvious that the royal demesne was now geared not so much to absorbe the demands of patronage but to provide a positive and lasting contribution to the expenses of government and king's household.

THE AMINISTRATION OF THE ROYAL DEMESNE: Tenants, Leases and Feus.

All landholdings in late Mediaeval Scotland were ultimately derived from the crown; the interest lies in the methods by which they were held and the variety of services and financial returns due to the crown. The 'terra regis' in Scotland, as in England, represented the entire kingdom, in which the king was the sole owner of land and royal vassals were stated merely to 'hold' ('tenet') their landed possessions. Tenants-in-chief held no land in their own right but 'of the king' ('de rege') for which they were bound to render something in return.

Throughout the Mediaeval period, successive Scottish kings, in an effort to attract the kyalty and the military support of their vassals and as a means of rewarding the favoured for their services to the crown, were compelled to subinfeudate large portions of the 'terra regis'. Subinfeudation was, in fact, a response to the heavy demands of royal patronage and the necessity of military support. Although subinfeudation of the 'terra regis' involved the transfer of many of the rights and profits attached to the estated in question, it did not include the actual transmission of ownership. In return for such grants and possessions, tenants-in-chief of the crown were required to perform certain services and/or pay certain dues to the crown, as quoted in the 'reddendo' recorded at the foot of each charter of gift. The necessity of providing for a royal army was an important feature of most land grants in the Middle Ages and many charters reflected this need. For instance, in the reign of Robert II, William, earl of Douglas received a hereditary gift of the lands of Tillicoultry in Clackmannan for the service of one knight. Although the letter of concession stated that the estate was to remain in the hands of the earl and his heirs in fee and heritage, nonetheless if was also recorded that the lands were 'held in heritage of us', ('de nobis tenuit hereditarie'). On 15 June 1498, Alexander MacLeod received a grant of

---

1. RMS, i, 504.

certain lands in Skye and Lewis for the service of one ship of 26 oars and two vessels of 16 oars to the king during both peacetime and wartime when ever required by the king or his lieutenant.[2] Judicial services were also required by certain charters, for, the 1458-9 charter of confirmation to Thomas, lord Erskine of the lands of Dunnottar in the Lennox stipulated his attendance at three court suits a year within the shire of Dumbarton.[3] As well as such services, subinfeudation also involved certain monetary payments, holdings in blanchfarm, for instance, contained nominal cash or kind 'reddendos' which were not always levied, while the holder of lands retained for the service of ward and relief was bound to submit to the crown the financial value of certain feudal incidents when they fell due. This type of holding frequently proved to be financially rewarding to the crown, especially when systematically exploited from the latter part of the fifteenth century. As feudal superior and the ultimate owner of all estates, the king was entitled to levy the casualties of relief, a sum of money, equivalent to the value of the estate for a single year,[4] which represented a fine payable on the recognition of the heir as the legal holder of the estate under the crown, wardship and marriage, since the person and the possessions of a minor fell temporarily to the crown as superior, and non entry, for the failure to secure legal infeftment to a particular holding resulted in its return to the crown from where it had originally been granted, from the Royal tenants-in-chief.[5] By their very nature, the income from feudal incidents was spasmodic, dependant on the occasional exercise of the king's right as feudal superior.

---

2. RMS, ii, 2420.
3. RMS, ii, 657.
4. The value of specific holdings were recorded in the retour of service, based on the findings of an inquest conducted by the local sheriff.
5. For details concerning the development and administration of these feudal casualties, see the chapters on the sheriff's accounts and the treasurer's charge.

The administration and fiscal exploitation of such estates was conducted by the tenant-in-chief, as stipulated in his charter of gift, and the benefit derived by the crown from lands which had been subinfeudated to royal vassals was confined to the details recorded in the 'reddendo'. The concern of this chapter is restricted to what may be termed 'the king's property' (de proprietate regis'),[6] representing estates which were permanently in the hands of the crown and from which annual farms and other profits were paid regularly to representatives of the crown. The systematic accumulation of these lands began with the return of James I and during the remainder of the Middle Ages the revenue accruing from them was destined to make a considerable contribution to the expenses of government and the royal household.

From 1434, the Exchequer Rolls provided a detailed, if uncoordinated, record of the financial contribution of the various Earldoms, Lordships and Baronies which had fallen into the hands of the crown. The accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra - the local fiscal official responsible for the collection of the annual profit emanating from these estates - represented the rolls of the king's property and contained a detailed record of its financial exploitation for the benefit of the crown. Between 1434 and 1450 knowledge of the administration of the royal demesne is limited by the low survival rate of the property rolls, but from the latter date, these accounts are almost totally complete.

The acquisition of an Earldom or Lordship by the crown in the fifteenth century meant that the king filled the gap vacated by the earl or lord, in other words, the king assumed the role of his own tenant-in chief. Essentially, the crown took over the two component parts of the inheritance, firstly the position of immediate feudal superior over the free tenants of the Earldom or Lordship - they represented a further stage in the process of subinfeudation - with the right of laying claim

---

6. ER, iv, 599.

to the various services and feudal incidents due from these sub-tenants and secondly the 'property' of the inheritance, from which the king was entitled to extract rents and other profits annually from the tenants. Within each Earldom or Lordship, the extent of property varied considerably, sometimes forming an extremely small portion of total area of the province.[7] Although, in the late fifteenth century, the chamberlain of Fife was charged with an annual farm of £632-12-1, 58 chalders of wheat, 93 chalders of barley, 4 bolls of 'bere', 8 bolls of oatmeal, 68 chalders of oats and large quantities of poultry, this valuable portion of royal property formed only a small sector of the entire Earldom of Fife.[8]

As it is now difficult to ascertain the precise boundries of Mediaeval earldoms and sheriffdoms and also the location of portions of land within them; a similar problem seems to have existed in the fifteenth century. Until the account of 1454, the lands of Glen were charged to the chamberlain of Menteith at an annual farm of £4, but in the 1451 account the farms were allowed to the chamberlain as an overcharge, "cum quibus computans est superius oneratus superflue",[9] and in the 1454 account, the lands were again declared overcharged, with the additional statement, "non repertarum infra balliam compotantis, ut asserit suo juramento".[10] The claim, even under oath, that a particular portion of land did not fall within the accountant's jurisdiction, may have involved an attempt to defraud the crown, but subsequent great seal charters referred to the lands of Glen within the barony of Callendar in Stirlingshire.[11]

---

7. For details, see the chapter on the acquisition and exploitation of royal estates.
8. ER, x, 446-7.
9. ER, v, 479
10. ER, v, 676.
11. RMS, ii, 606, 3527. In the former charter, the lands of Glen were valued at 5 marks 'old extent'. In fact, Glen was located just south of Falkirk near the modern Callendar park.

Also the fact that there is no further mention of Glen in the rentals of the earldom of Menteith suggests that the accountant's claim was justified. However such ignorance of the exact boundries of the crown patrimony gave ample scope for baronial infiltration. In the 1459 account of the Chamberlain of Royal property North of the Dee is the first record of the claim by the earl of Huntly to the lands of Schefin, which, according to the rolls, were situated in the lordship of Strathdearn in Invernesshire and were described as "de proprietate regis".[12] Later, in the account of 1462, the earl's claim is more fully explained, for he asserted that the lands had, in fact, been included in his hereditary grant of the lordship of Badenoch.[13] The struggle continued unresolved until 12 February 1505-6 when Alexander, earl of Huntly received a hereditary concession of the lands of Schefin, with a full explanation that the lands 'had been claimed and occupied previously by the said earl, but had been adjudged to belong to the king; and which, for his faithful service, were annexed to the lordship of Badenoch.' Since the date of the original claim by Huntly the farms of the lands of Schefin had been illegally removed by the earl but the charter, for which Huntly submitted a composition of £50 to the treasurer, exonerated the earl from responsibility for farms raised by him in the past.[14]

Except where small portions of royal property were occupied by the kings's own goods and livestock or set aside for forest and hunting, exploitation of the royal demesne involved the leasing of estates, in both large and small allocations, to tenants, for which they submitted an annual

---

12. ER, vi, 523
13. ER, vii, 129
14. ER, xii, 416. RMS, ii, 2930. TA, iii, 224. SRO, Gordon Castle Muniments, GD 44, 10/2/1.

rent to the crown. From 1480 the appendix to the Exchequer Rolls contained a detailed record of the crown rental books, 'Rentalia Domini Regis'. The style and form of these varied very little and contained extremely useful information concerning the portions of land under leasehold, the name of the leasee or leasees, the duration of the lease, the date of commencement of the tenure, the rent charged, both in cash and in kind, and the various other services and profits due by the tenant. Most of the landed property belonging to the crown was recorded in these rental books, including the lease of many lands in the Highland region forfeited by John, lord of the Isles, namely Trotternish, Isley, Kintyre and other estates on the western seaboard,[15] the lands of Dirleton and Haliburton, which were temporarily in royal hands as the king' ward,[16] and the lands of Drumcoll, the meadow of Edinburgh and the assise of herrings of the West Sea, all of which were not under the responsibility of the Ballivi ad Extra.[17] However, certain areas of royal property were not mentioned in the rentals, for instance, the earldom of March and Mar, Kintore, Bute, Arran and Cowal. The theory behind the system of leasing was that it represented a contract between the king and his immediate tenant over the temporary disposition of a portion of royal property. The tenant was granted occupancy to a particular section of the royal demesne for a stated term, at the end of which the contract was terminated and a fresh on was then arranged by royal representatives. In theory, the contract involved a short term settlement between the crown and the tenant and on its completion, the latter retained no special claim on the subsequent renewal of the contract. Under the terms of the contract, the tenant was bound to pay an annual rent to the crown for the right of tenure, a

---

15. ER, xii, 674, 698-709

16. ER, xii, 694-5

17. ER, x, 637, 638, xii, 644.

grassum, calculated at one year's rent, at the outset of the contract, an entry fine if the tenants were occupying the lands in question for the first time and any other dues and services attached to the tenancy.

The leasing of the royal demesne was conducted by commissioners, appointed by the crown through letters issued under the privy seal.[18] Included in the letters of commission, some of which were entered in the appendix of the Exchequer Rolls before the actual details of the leases concluded, were the names of the individual commissioners appointed and, although their numbers varied, a quorum, normally consisting of three, of which the comptroller was always one, seems to have conducted the actual business.[19] A review of the names on these commissions suggests that the king regarded the leasing of his lands as a business of the greatest importance. The consideration with which the settlement of royal leases was regarded can be assessed by the fact that those involved in these commissions reflected the political climate of the time. In the 1484 commission to let crown lands, those selected induded Colin, Earl of Argyll, Andrew, Lord Avondale, and John Ramsey of Bothwell, while the commission of 1488, selected just after the defeat of James III at Sauchieburn, was packed with the members of the rebel faction, namely such men as Patrick, Lord Hailes, Robert, Lord Lyle, Laurence, Lord Oliphant, John, Lord Drummond, Sir William Knollis, Master William Hepburn, clerk of the Register, Archibald Edmonstone of Duntreath, John Hepburn, Prior of St.Andrews and Colin, Earl of Argyll, the latter had changed sides sinde 1484.[20] It should be noted, that these men were, during their respective periods of power, holders of the highest offices in Scotland, for the Earl of Argyll was chancellor on both occassions, John Ramsey of Bothwell

---

18. ER, x, 636, 664.

19. See Appendix No.A/8(c) The letter of commission for the leasing of crown property in 1488.

20. ER, x, 629, ix, 603.

was one of the 'king's favourites', Lord Hailes was the Master of the Household, Lord Lyle was the king's Justiciar, Sir William Knollis was the Treasurer to James IV, and the Prior of St.Andrews was the Keeper of the Privy Seal. Two men overlapped the crisis of 1488 and were present on the commission on both occasions, namely Alexander Inglis and Master Richard Robinson, the parson of Southwick, reflecting the permanence of certain of the professional civil servants despite political crisis. In the majority of these commissions, the members were composed of two main groups, the king's closest advisers and councillors, and the professional body of men who performed the more tedious side of the king's administration. Since it was impractical for so many of the king's advisers to travel the countryside leasing his lands, a quorum, always including the comptroller, usually tended to this duty. This quorum, engaged to lease a specific area of crown land property, was composed of a small representative cross section of the commission as a whole, with, in addition, thefrequent attendance of local men whose knowledge and position determined their inclusion. For instance, for the lease of the lands of the earldom of Moray in 15 January 1497-8, all the above sections were represented, the King's councillors by the Earls of Argyll and Lennox, Lords Gray and Hume, the professional civil servants by Richard Murehead, the king's secretary, and Walter Drummond, clerk of the register, and the local contingent by William, Bishop of Aberdeen, the Bishop of Moray and George, Earl of Huntly.[21] Although the composition of these commissions varied considerably, there was a core of almost constant attenders, for names like the earl of Argyll, William Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen, Henry Alan, later Abbot of Jedburgh, and of course, the comptroller of the time, appeared more frequently than others. Despite the fact, that most of the king's commissions specifically named a quorum for the leasing of crown lands, usually 'thre of thame

---

21. ER, xi, 387

conjunctlie, oure said comptroller beand ane of the thre'[22] the granting of individual commissions to lease certain royal properties in the west were not uncommon; for the lands of Lochaber were leased by the Earl of Argyll alone,[23] while the Earl of Huntly was commissioned to let the lands of Glengarry and Invergarry [24] and also the lands of Knoydart in 1507.[25] These commissions were normally based in one of the principal burghs within the locality, the commissioners leasing the lands of the earldom of Fife tended to operate from either Falkland, Cupar, Inverkeithing or St.Andrews,[26] but they also worked from Edinburgh, the venue employed from letting crown lands as far apart as Moray and Dundonald.[27]

The powers given to the commissioners were considerable. Those appointed to the commission to lease crown property on 12 December 1492 were given 'our full power ... to set all and sindri our saidis landis quhere sumever thai be within our realme for ... yeris forsaid or schorter as sal be sene spedfull to thaim, and to continew and prolong the takkis of thaim for the said termes or schorter that hes ony tak of ws yit to ryn ... courtis to set and to hald, trespassouris to punys, amerciamentis, unlawis, and eschetis to raise an uplift to our sue, with power the tenentis and inhavitantis the saidis landis to remofe and put in gif it plese' and to perform any other function assosicated with the operation of leasing.[28] Apart from supervising the leasing of royal lands, the commission retained certain judicial powers in connection with unco-operative tenants. There is little information as to the exact form

---

22. ER, x, 629
23. ER, xi, 460
24. R.S.S., i, 1543.
25. R.S.S, i, 1579.
26. ER, ix, 587, 642, x,669, 746.
27. ER, x, 761, : xiii, 656
28. ER, x, 710-1.

leasing royal estates took but it appears unlikely that the commissioners reviewed the details of each individual lease. The heavy conservatism of Scottish financial arrangements throughout the fifteenth century would suggest that, in the majority of cases, leases were merely renewed in exact detail following a quick consultation of past rental books. The rentals were full of evidence of such conservatism. For instance, in 1486 the tack of 8 bovates of the Halls of Airth was granted to Malcolm Forrester through royal letters issued under the privy seal for an annual cash farm stated to be 'as in the rental and the last lease', and several letters of lease quoted in the Register of the Privy Seal failed to record a specific 'reddendo', merely stating that payment was to include 'all dewteis aucht and wont as is contenit in the rentall'.[29] Many royal leases settled during the majority of Henry VI in England included the same conservative tendancy with the proliferation of such phrases as 'at the rate of the extent' or 'at the usual farm'.[30] It was common practice for auditors, accountants and other royal administrators to settle matters in the light of details extracted from past records. Unless instructed to the contrary, it is likely that commissioners accepted the same tenants under terms similar to the previous lease, as established by previous rental books, and even if the name of the tenant was changed, it was uncommon for the terms to alter. The fact that king's rentals seldom varied in form or detail suggests that such a policy was in operation.

Writing in the sixteenth century, John Major expounded on the disadvantages of the shortness of the Scottish lease. He maintained, 'Further, in Scotland the houses of the country people are small, as it were cottages, and the reason is this: they have no permanent buildings, but hired only, or in lease for four or five years, at the pleasure of

---

29. ER, ix, 612. RSS, i, 444.

30. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 104

the lord of the soil; therefore do they not dare to build good houses, though stone abound; neither do they plant trees or hedges for their orchards, nor do they dung the land; and this is no small loss and damage to the whole realm. If the landlords would let their lands in perpetuity, they might have double and treble of the profit that now comes to them - and for this reason; the country folk would then cultivate their land beyond all comparison better, would grow richer, and would build fair dwellings that whould ne an ornament to the country.[31] This lack of tenurial security must have had an adverse affect on the state of Scottish agriculture through the inherent lack of incentive. In the middle of the fifteenth century, efforts were made in Parliament to ensure against the arbitrary removal of tenants under specific circumstances. In 1449, it was ordained that 'the buyer of landis suld keep the tackes set before the bying' and that the leases were to endure until the termination of the contract.[32] However, such a statute, even if efficiently enforced, only touched the top of the iceberg. Late Mediaeval lay rentals are extremely scarce, with the result it is difficult to assess the average duration of this type of lease. In the rental of the Regality of Dalkeith in 1376 almost all the leases were for one year, with only a few for a longer duration.[33] A later collection of rentals for the regality of Dalkeith, dated around 1440, revealed that the vast majority of leases were still granted only for a period of a single year with longer tenures very much the exception.[34] The Huntly rental of 1600 revealed the commonest length of leases as being five years.[35] The leases which still exist for the

---

31. John Major, History of Greater Britain, Scot. Hist. Soc., x, 31.

32. APS, ii, 35.

33. Registrum Honoris de Morton, ii, Appendix, xlvii - lxxvi.
The majority leased for one year, but 5 leases lasted 2 years
6 leases lasted 3 years
1 lease lasted 4 years

34. SRO, Morton Papers, GD 150/100a

35. Spalding Club Miscellany, iv. 241-2

fifteenth century are principally those recorded in family muniments, and are mostly of unusually long duration, and probably in return for special services rendered to the land owner. For example, in 15 July 1473, William Stirling of Keir granted a lease of five eighteenths of the land of Kennoway in Fife to John Beaton of Balfour for the term of 19 years at the rental of 18 marks, and 6/11 annually.[36] The survival of such lay leases forthe fifteenth century was undoubtedly due to the exceptional length of their tenure. The leasing of ecclesiastical land for the fifteenth century is more fully recorded. In the records of Paisley Abbey, there are recorded two rentals for the mid fifteenth century, the first dated April 1460, and other other 24 July 1464, Considering the length of time between the two leases and the fact that the latter was to endure for the following five years after the next Whitsun time,[37] it may be assumed that for this period at least, five year leases were in operation at Paisley. At Arbroath, however, small areas and tofts were usually leased for the term of five years, but many larger portions of the Abbey lands were let for periods of 5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17 years and even for life.[38] The records of leasing by other ecclesiastical bodies reveal the similar trends, and, although they appear in general to have favoured slightly longer leases than their lay counterparts, neither branches of the land owning class were willing to adopt a policy of consistantly long leases.

Concerning the length of crown leases, the terms of most of the commissions for the leasing of these lands stated clearly, that they were to be let 'for the termez of thre yeris or five yeris as thai think

---

36. Fraser, Stirlings of Keir and their Family Papers., 43.
37. Lees, The Abbey of Paisley, Appendix, lvi-lxxiii.
38. Liber De Aberbrothoc, ii, charter Nos. 184, 191, 209, 237, 238, 239, 246, 248, 252, 256, 258, 263, 265.

expedient'.[39] It was usual for the comissioners to opt for the shorter lease. In a memorandum following the letter of commission for the leasing of the Forest of Ettrick in 1486, the commissioners were required to settle the present lease for the term of three years only and no more ('nonultra').[40] However, the commission to Alexander, Earl of Huntly to lease the lands of Glengarry and Invergarry, dated 13 September 1507, put the emphasis on the longer lease, when it stated 'gevand him power to sett the landis of Glengarry..... for the termes of five yeris nixt tocum efter the daid herof, or schortar, gif he thinkis it expedient for the kingis proffet'.[41] On the 22 April 1511, there wa a commission, comprising of the bishops of Caithness and Aberdeen, the Abbot of Jedburgh, the Earls of Argyll and Lennox, and Sir John Ramsey of Terrenzeane, appointed to 'set all and sindry his landis and lordschippis within his realme, in few of for takkis or termex, so that thai exceid nocht ix yeris, for the utilite and proffit of the croun'.[42] That last phrase in the above in the commissioners letter of reference, represented the corner stone of the crown's policy in the leasing of its property, for the prime consideration was greater profit. The benefit to the crown from shorter leases lay in the more frequent levy of the grassum. Raised at the outset of each fresh tack, it was obviously to the crown's advantage that it should be collected every three years instead of five or seven year intervals.

For the period before 1480, it is difficult to assess the average length of the crown leases, but it is almost certain that they varied little in duration from those at the end of the fifteenth century. The

---

39. ER, x, 629

40. ER, ix, 615.

41. RSS, i, 1543.

42. RSS, i, 2236.

crown rentals at the close of the fifteenth century reveal that the main stretch of tenure was three years. The lease was often granted to take effect for the following Whitsun or whatever date the previous lease was due to expire. There are examples of leases being operative after the termination of the existing lease, which could be one or two years in the future.[43] On 12 June 1486, the lands of one Stead of Harehead, in the ward of Ettrick, were leased to Patrick Murray of Fallohill and his son John for the term of three years after the expiry of the terms of their previous lease, which had been granted through the royal letters and which, it was stated, had as yet three years left to run, and thus the tenancy of that particular portion of land was extended to a total of six years.[44] Although it was normal procedure for leases to be settled shortly before the termination of the previous one, the lease of Kilmarnock on 14 July 1488 was settled for the term of three years 'a Penthecoste elapso'.[45] On 9 April 1501 the fishing of the Spey was leased to master James Douglas, in the name of the community of the burgh of Elgin for the term of three or five years after the feast of St.Andrew just past and they were to inform the king and his commissioners within the month as to the length of lease preferred, failing which the decision as to the length of tenure was to fall to the king.[46] However, a letter of indenture, issued under the privy seal on 2 May, related that the Spey fishing had been let by the king to the burgh for the term of three years, but in recompence for the shorter lease, the annual 'reddendo' was reduced from 4 lasts of salmon to 3½ lasts.[47] There were, however, portions of the king's property which were let for terms longer than the norm of three years.

---

43. ER, ix, 562, 623, 627

44. ER, ix, 615

45. ER, x, 630

46. ER. xi, 434

47. RSS, i, 682.

These longer leases were more common in the reign of James IV, and especially after 1500, but they are still evident during the reign of his father. In areas of royal demesne leased specifically for the king's profit, the three year tenure was actively encouraged although longer five year leases were also in evidence. On 10 June 1485 certain lands within the forest of Ettrick were let for 5 years while the rest of the royal property within the forest was settled in three year tenancies.[48] Between 11 and 13 March 1481-2 all the lands of the lordship of Galloway were leased to tenants for the period of 5 years following the termination of previous contracts, but the commissioners leasing the lordship on 5 March 1488-9 were instructed to permit only the shorter three year lease.[49] However, the five years lease of 1481-2 was not repeated in Galloway in the succeeding years, for, until 1503, the rentals recorded a series of leases of three years duration.[50] However, around 1500 there was a general trend towards longer leases, and eventually to feuing. Although Galloway was not subject to the latter alternative, in May 1503, the lands were let to tenants for a period of 9 years, and in May 1512, for a period of 5 years.[51] Five year leases were also adopted in the lands of Petty and Brackley in October 1499, Ardmernach in October 1504, Ross in May 1507 and Moray in June 1511, while the Earldom of Strathearn in April 1502 and Stewarton in August 1507 were leased for 9 years.[52] Yet, there is a strange contrast to this trend, for on the 8 June 1506, the rental of the lordships of the Southern Islands, including Isley, Swinfort, Jura and Colonsay, revealed that the were leased for the term of only one year, dated from the preceeding Pentecost.[53]

---

48. ER, ix, 609.
49. ER, ix, 582-6, x, 656-8.
50. ER, x, 655, 701, 739. : xi, 451.
51. ER, xii, 650. : xiii, 602.
52. ER, xi, 444 (i.e the lands of Petty, Brackley, Leffarrar, Strathdearn and the barony of Bovachquhair); xii, 660 ; xiii, 597, 593.
53. ER, xii, 709.

It was custumary for most of the property within an Earldom or Lordship to be leased at the same time and for similar lengths of tenure, thus reducing administrative inconvenience associated with the renewal of royal leases to a minimum. Thus, when the lordship of Galloway was leased for the term of 5 years in March 1481-2 this operation included a substantial proportion of the royal estates within the lordship which had not been granted out or assigned. This represented, in fact, the official leasing of the lordship of Galloway. However, certain areas of royal property within the Lordship got out of step with the cycles of these official leases. The principal cause of certain individual leases being settled outwith the official lease was that the former were being granted for terms longer than the duration of the official lease, and were therefore, liable for renewal at a different time from those in the same vicinity. Although the earldom of Fife as a whole was always leased for the term of three years until set in feu on 4 March 1509-10,[54] there are frequent examples of portions of land leased for terms longer than the official lease. The lands of Cameron, in the Quarter of Falkland, were, until the lease of 18 December 1495, leased in accordance with the official lease of the earldom. At that date, however, the lands of Cameron were leased to James Scot for the usual term of three years, but, immediately after that entry, there followed a supplementary note, stating that, 'now by the special written mandate of the lord king the lands were leased to John Hiltson by a second letter of lease issued under the privy seal' and that the new lease has been contracted at Edinburgh on 22 December 1496.[55] Although length of tenure was quoted for the new lease, an entry in the Register of the Privy Seal for 16 July 1498 recorded a letter of tack to John Hiltson and his son William of the lands of Cameron and the Mill of Freuchie for the term of 19 years at 'the usual rate of rental', although

---

54. ER, xiii, 617.

55. ER, x, 749.

the year of granting is not specified.[56] On the 22 February 1499-1500, the lands of Cameron were leased to Rose Arnot, widow of James Abercrombie, and her son John for 9 years, a lease recorded in the Privy Seal Register,[57] and in 15 March 1507-8 the lease was renewed to the same tenants for a further 9 years.[58] The history of the leasing of the lands of Cameron after 1496 represents a prime example of the way in which a small portion of royal property became detached the official leasing pattern of a substantial part of the earldom of Fife. Although mention was made of the lengthy leasing arrangements for the lands of Cameron in the records of the official lease of the earldom of Fife on 13 May 1499, 5 April 1502, 7 May 1505 and 1 May 1508 the lands in question were not actually involved in the triennial renewal of leases within the earldom.[59] However, if would also be noted that although John Hiltson was in receipt of a 19 year lease from 1498 he seems to have his grant for only three years. As well as extended leases from anywhere between 5 to 19 years in duration, there were also leases granted for life. On 15 September 1498, the lands of Balbreky in the earldom of Fife were let to David Prat for 'all the days of his life' but in the official lease of the earldom on the 7 May 1505, the lands were stated to have been let to Archibald Beaton, since the death of David Prat had resulted in the vacation of the lease.[60] The increase in public records for the reign of James IV makes this movement easier to trace but the surviving evidence suggests that longer leases were operative, to a lesser degree, in the early part of the reign of James III. In the 1474 account of Orkney and Shetland, it was stated that the entire lordship had been leased to William, Bishop of Orkney for life, through letters granted

---

56. RSS, i, 231.
57. RSS, i, 481 ; ER, xi, 427.
58. RSS, i, 1639.
59. ER, xi, 427, xii, 617, 688, xiii, 610.
60. RSS, i, 256. ; ER, xii, 688, 190 ; Also see Appendix No. for the Privy Seal grants of extended leases for the earldom of Fife.

under the great seal.[61] Also, in a letter, granted under the privy seal, dated 8 July 1477, and recorded at the end of the 1477 account of the earldom of Fife, the lands of Largo, with all their attachments, were leased to Andrew Wood of Leith, the king's servant, for the term of 19 years.[62]

Throughout the fifteenth century, short leases of 3 and occasionally 5 years were in operation on royal estates. Royal leases for periods beyond these terms were born of special circumstances; a form of royal patronage of to suit the requirements of a particular region.[63] In such cases, the gift was accompanied by a royal letter usually under the privy seal, explaining the exceptional nature of the lease. In 1485 the king's rentals recorded that the lands of Culcagry and Methfield in the ward of Twynholm were leased to Robert Carlyle for 7 years and there followed a copy of the royal letter of lease, dated 2 December 1483, which repeated in detail the terms of the contract mentioning that Robert was to enter his holding after the termination of the previous lease held by Andrew, elect of Moray.[64] However, that last statement revealed that reliance on past records could be extremely misleading, even to contemporaries. The abpve letter stated that lord Carlyle was to enter the lease which Andrew, elect of Moray 'hes now in tak of us' and although it was recorded in the March 1481-2 lease of Galloway that the lands of Culagry and Methfield had been let to Andrew Stewart, provost of Lincluden (later Bishop of Moray) the entry had been deleted and Hugh Douglas was declared tenant through a special royal mandate, conveyed verbally and witnessed by the earl of Angus.[65]

---

61. ER,viii, 224

62. ER, viii, 450.

63. The fact that large tracts of royal property in the remoter regions were leased for long terms to important local persons, has been discussed later in this chapter.

64. ER, ix, 611.

65. ER, ix, 585-6.

In return for the right to the lease, the tenant was required to pay a fixed annual rent as well as performing certain services. Because both the king's rental and the gross charge recorded in the accounts of the various Ballivi ad Extra were heavily conservative in form, variations which occurred between the two records concerning the revenue payable from a particular portion of royal property tended to continue for long periods. The fact that both statements were based to a great extent on the details registered in previous rentals and accounts and that there existed a great reluctance to alter the terms set down, largely explains the continued prevalence of this contradictory position. The Ballivi ad Extra was, in theory, responsible for the collection of the total farm recorded in his charge, which although based on the rentals, may or may not correspond to the sums recorded in them. The tenant, on the other hand, was bound to pay the accountant only the 'reddendo' registered in the book of rentals or entered in a lease charter. Variations between the two totals forced the accountant to seek an allowance from the auditors at the annual Exchequer, thus the true gross revenue paid over to the Ballivi ad Extra was represented by the rental not his gross charge. In the 1480 account of the Ranger of Ettrick, the accountant was allowed £160-4/- since the 3 places of Redford, the 2 places of Montcolman, and the middle place of Langhope had, for periods ranging from 9 to 13 years, been leased to John Cranstone of that ilk for cash, 'ut patet in rentali', at variance from the figures recorded in the ranger's charge.[66] The word "superflue" or overcharge in the account rolls usually denoted that there existed a discrepancy between the amount of rent stated in the rental and the amount charged to the Ballivi ad Extra. In the 1496 account of the lordship of Galloway, the position is fully recorded; for, it was recorded that, in 1480 and the succedding next three years, the rental for the lands of

---

66. ER, ix, 33.

Kitsdale, Arborg and Leffnolls amounted to 16 marks, a sum with which the accountant of the time was also charged, but from 1484, the chamberlain Adam Mure, was charged with a farm of 22 marks and this sum continued to be charged until the present account, a total of 13 years. For these years there was a discrepancy of £52 from the farms due according to the rental. The accountant was ordered by the auditors to levy only 16 marks in the future until the matter was resolved by the king.[67] In the rentals, the lands continued to be leased for 16 marks until 14 July 1501,[68] when they were leased to Joan Kennedy, Lady of Bothwell for 9 years at an annual rent of 22 marks. This is a prime example of the conservative nature of the property rolls, for such a discrepancy was allowed to remain unaltered for a period of 13 years before any attempt was made to resolve the situation. The inflexibility of both the king's rentals and the accounting system, coupled with the king's own unwillingness to accept a diminution in his rental, was reflected in the affairs of the lordship of Glencairny. With the forefeiture of Archibald Douglas, Earl of Moray in 1455, the above lands were brought into the hands of the crown.[69] Immediately, and obviously without any assessment of the fiscal potential of the area concerned, the lands of Glencairny were leased for an annual rent of £110,[70] but in the account for the Whitsun term of 1457, there was an allowance of £10 since it had been decided to lease the land at a lower rate.[71] In the year 1458 there was a drastic cut in the annual farm to £40, and from 1458 to 1466, the rent elevated to only £60 annually.[72] However, from 1473, the crown reasserted its intention to collect the full £110 and the chamberlain of Moray was thus charged, with the additional

---

67. ER, x, 572-3
68. ER, xi, 455.
69. Fraser, Chief of Grants, i, LII
70. ER, vi, 212, 379
71. ER, vi, 377
72. ER, vi, 460, 513.

note 'et rentale continet £110'.[73] Unfortunately the wealth of the lordship had not risen accordingly for the lands had been leased to sir Duncan Grant for £60 annually, thus leaving an annual overcharge in the accountant's records of £50.[74] Although, in the 1474 account, the chamberlain was ordered to raise the entire charge, when the question of new lease arose in 1487, he asserted that he could only raise £69 annually from the lands.[75] Despite the feu charter which raised the rental of Glencairny to £67 annually on 4 february 1498, the accounts of the chamberlain of Moray, and later of John Grant of Freuchy himself, continue to reveal a loss of anticipated revenue of £43 annually.[76] For the entire period, from 1455 to the end of the reign of James IV the crown's reluctance to accept the economics of the situation and alter the accountant's charge, had resulted in the accounts of these lands requiring an annual allowance for the loss of revenue, such an entry involved no physical transfer of money but was purely paper work.

The conservative and rather rigid appearance of both the king's rentals and the farm levels charged annually to the accountant reflected more a customary level of rent rather than one based on the true market value of the property concerned. Such a complaint was levelled against the leases settled during the personal reign of Henry VI and there can be little doubt that a similar situation also existed in Scotland. Generally speaking, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was an era which tended to favour the tenant rather than the landlord. This situation was largely the result of a dramatic shift in population trends which affected nearly the whole of late

---

73. ER, vii, 219 ; viii, 46
74. ER, vii, 376
75. ER, vii, 221 : viii, 499.
76. Fraser Chief of Grants , iii, 43-4 ER, xii 287 In feu charter, the Grant included the lands of Balnadalach and Clencairny at £71 annually, the former in the Moray rental at £4 annual farm.

Mediaeval Europe. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a steadily rising population created an increasing demand for the produce of the land, grain prices rose and many landowners profited from the direct exploitation of their own demesne. However, by the outset of the fourteenth century, the pressure of population on available food resources had attained saturation level and a series of prolonged famines and bad harvests had a disastrous effect on a population already stretching the limits of the argricultural productivity. The high mortality rate resulting from a deterioration in climatic conditions and famine was further exacerbated from 1348 with the first incursions of the Black Death, which especially in 1348-9 and 1361, decimated large sections of a population already weakened by the pressures of the previous half century. Although natural buoyancy redressed the worst affects of this decline in the population, the frequent recurrance of both plague and famine continued to prune the population well into the fifteenth century. As a result of this sharp decline in population, many of the survivors benefitted from the transformation from a sellers to a buyers market. The effect on agriculture was revolutionary; the reduced pressure on foodstuffs and the high cost of farm labour forced many landlords to change from demesne farming to leasing their property to tenants in return for rent and a reduction in the demand for land forced down both the price of real estate and also the level of rent obtainable from property. Concerning the latter point, the leasing of private estates had been in operation since the thirteenth century but the depressed population of the next two centuries created land surplus resulting in sharp reductions in rent levels and the forcing of many estates out of cultivation. The events of the first half of the fourteenth century ensured the continuation of the leasing system and 'converted it into an ecomonic trap for landlords of the later Middle Ages'.[77] Declining rents were prevalent throughout most of the European continent, in the bishopric of Durham estate revenues

---

77. Miskimin, The Economy of Early Renaissance Europe, 42.

fell by 70% between 1308 and 1446, in Pistoia rent, paid in wheat, fell 40% from the pre-plague level, those of the Abbey of St.Germain-des-Fres dropped 34% between 1360-1400 and 1422-60 while those of Norfolk fell just over 30% in the same period.[78]

Unfortunately, knowledge of population and economic movements in Scotland during this period is severly restricted by a drastic shortage of information. It would seem that the plague hit Scotland in 1349 and according to Wyntoun:

> In Scotlande the fyrst pestilence
> Begouthe, withe sa gret wyolence
> That it was said of liffande men
> The thrid part it distroyit then;
> Eftyr that in til Scotlande
> A zhere or mare it was sedande.
> Befor that tyme was neuir seyn
> A pestilence in our lande sa keyne;
> Bath men, and barnnys, and women,
> It sparit noucht for a keyl then. [79]

It seems likely that the scattered, mostly rural population of Scotland suffered less from the effects of famine and plague, than the more developed regions of Europe. The economic consequence of the decline in the population of Scotland was not so severe as in other areas, firstly these natural disasters do not appear to have resulted in the same dramatic demographic effects in Scotland and also the small urban communities provided only a restricted block of unproductive consumers, not creating the same pressure on supplies of agricultural produce. However, even the fall in the rural population would have been sufficiently extensive to cause a drop in the demand for available land, thus lowering rents and increasing the areas of waste.

Evidence concerning rent levels before 1450 is extremely meagre, but the available evidence suggests that the value of land suffered a decline during the fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth, although

---

78. Ibid, 30, 47.

79. Wyntoun, The Original Chronicle, ed., Amours, vi, 197.

the downwards movement does not seem to have been as dramatic as in England. Apart from the effects of a declining population, the disrupting effect of the wars of independance in the late thirteenth and early fourteen centuries must also have encouraged the tendancy toward lower rents. Retours of the early fifteenth century revealed that the value of real estate had, compared with estimates from the late thirteenth century, declined slightly or, at best, remained static. In a retour dated 7 February 1468-9 the lands of Cunygais in the shire of Inverness were valued at £2 annually 'now' or 'new extent', the true value of the lands at the precise moment as assessed by the local inquest, but were declared to have been worth 10 marks 'in time of peace', a reference to the period before the wars of independance.[80] On 15 July 1443 the retour settling James Douglas heir to the lands of Morton, Preston, Buittle, Borg, Moffat and Hutton in Dumfriesshire assessed the worth of these estates at £20 'now' and the same 'in the time of peace'.[81] Several of the surviving retours of the first half of the fifteenth century contained similar valuations to the one quoted above. Even by January 1495-6 the lordship of Eskdale, held by Archibald, earl of Angus, retained a 'new extent' assessment of only 200 marks whereas 'in time of peace' the lands were recorded as being worth 300 marks.[82]

There is little information concerning the movement of rent levels in royal property in the fourteenth century, but, in the light of the evidence quoted above, it would seem that there was a decline in the returns from royal estates. In the mid fourteenth century, the land of Bothkennar provided an annual farm of 20 chalders of wheat and 12 chalders of meal, but a century later, the same estate yielded the small return of £70 in cash, and 10 chalders, 12 bolls of meal.[83] In 1380 the annual farm from the lands

---

80. Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, ii, 28-9
81. SRO, Morton Papers, GD 150/103.
82. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 151
83. ER, ii, 297-8, 576, vii, 49.

of Gask, Blairin-roar, Glenlichern and Trowan amounted to £30-13-4, by 1445 the farm had fallen to £27 but in the 1460s the annual return from these lands had risen to £29-13-4.[84] Therefore, it would seem that during the first half of the fifteenth century, rents derived from royal property were either declining or remained relatively static. From the second quarter of the century, there is evidence of a slow recovery. In 1451 the land, mill and brewery of Kinclaven submitted a gross annual farm of £15-3-4 but four years later the level had risen to £20 annually.[85] In 1444 the chamberlain of Strathearn was charged with a total farm of £376 for the two years prior to the account while in 1465 the chamberlain was responsible for the collection of £383, the rent of Strathearn for a single year (a total which excluded the lands of Balquhidder, amounting to a two year farm of £120 in 1444 and which had been transferred to the chamberlain of Menteith). This dramatic increase was not only due to the substantial additions of property to the account - not accounted for in 1444 through accounting inefficiency and also through the steady leasing of estates previously in waste - but also the the reviewing of the annual farm attached to various portions of land within the earldom. For instance, the annual farm of the lands of Glentarf, Dundurn, Tulliebanocher and Ross, Dalginross and Westerdowny rose from £4-13-4, £13-6-8, £6-13-4, £4 and £1 respectively in 1444 to £12, £22, £10-13-4, £6 and £4 by 1465.[86] From the Whitsun term of 1462 the lands of Glenbeth, Ardbeth, Glenogle and Achray, previously leased for an annual farm of 25 marks, were now to contribute £20 annually to the accountant.[87] Although the overall tendancy during the middle of the fifteenth century was for royal rents to be revised upwards the financial potential of certain portions of royal property was downgraded.

---

84. ER, iii, 36, v, 262-4, vii, 54-5.
85. ER, v, 480-1, vi, 50.
86. ER, v, 170-1, vii, 324-6.
87. ER, vii, 170.

Between 1444 and 1456 the rent derived from the lands of Glentarken fell from £10 annually to 10 marks. Similarly, between 1451 and 1460 the cash farms charged to the chamberlain of Fife rose from £557 to £593, with the annual rent due from the smithy and cottages of Auchtermuchty rising from £3-18-6 to £4-5-10 and that from the lands of Urquhart from £10 to 20 marks. A similar recovery was reflected in the surviving rentals of the regality of Dalkeith between 1376 and 1440. Between these two dates, the yearly rent from the barony of Preston rose from £23-6-8 to £43, that of Morton from £49-10/- to £59-6-8 and Buittle from £70-16-8 to £78. A substantial proportion of this increase resulted from the inclusion of new estates, for in 1376 the rental of the barony of Preston consisted of the village and mill of Preston and the lands of Glenwaldy whereas the later rental of 1440 had added the lands of Ladyland. In addition, properties seem to have increased in value, for instance the tenants of the village and mill of Preston submitted an aggregate farm of £15-6-8 in 1376 but by 1440 the rent had been elevated to £27 while the rents payable from the park of Morton and the lands of Erismorton rose from 10 marks each to 12 marks between the two dates. Similar rent increases were recorded in several estates within the regality, although the rate of augmentation tended to vary considerable, but it must also be said that many portions of land retained the same value and a few even fell. The rent of the Mill of Dalfibble descended from £8 to 8 marks between 1376 and 1440.[88]

It would appear that, during the reign of James II, the crown, as reflected in the charge side of the Ballivi ad Extra accounts, attempted not only to bring more estates under the jurisdiction of the local chamberlain or receiver but also to elevate the rent derived from various properties. Although the increasing demand for the lease of royal estates must have been sufficient to encourage such a course, such an

---

88. SRO, Morton Papers, GD 150/100a.

economic recovery must hot be overstressed. Firstly, the farms quoted in the accountant's charge were not always realistic pointers to the actual rent paid by royal tenants, often artificially high in order to encourage the accountant to extract the maximum return. Although no rentals have survived for this period to verify the actual rent levels, allowances for waste and overcharge within the discharge side of the same accounts reflected the over optamistic nature of the gross charge. For instance, in 1455 Thomas Wardroper, the mair and receiver of the lands of Methven and others in Perthshire,was granted an allowance of £40 for the entire farm of the lands of the demesne of Methven which was in waste, in the same year, £56-13/- of a total farm of £113-6/- for the lands of Strathbrok was discharged to the receiver of Linlithgowshire for the same reason and in following year, the chamberlain of Mar successfully sought an allowance of £116-11-9 in his account for waste and overcharge declared for that year and a further £167-19-2 for similar reasons from the years prior to that account.[89] Also, the two accounts of Master Thomas Carmichael, chamberlain of the earldoms of Mar and Moray between 1458 and 1460, recorded an aggregate deficit within the accounts of £208 for lands in waste and farm levies unrelated to the actual rent established in the book of rentals.[90] In addition, similar accounting losses were often submerged in substantial arrears totals which accumulated at the foot of each account. Secondly, although certain rent increases seem to have been attempted by the crown at this juncture, the evidence would suggest that the level was still financially lower than those in existance before the plague. In 1454 the rent of the lands of Bonnoch and Bannacher stood at a mere £10 annually although it was recorded that formerly the lands had been valued at 100 marks 'old extent'.[91] There is no hint as to the origin of the

---

89. ER, vi, 52, 234, 266-71.
90. ER, vi, 512-531, 647-667.
91. ER, v, 654.

'old extent' but the difference in value would suggest that it was based on an assesment settled before the economic disruption of the early fourteenth century. In the three terms prior to 1456 the lands were leased to Robert Stewart for no return and although the rent was raised to £30 annually sometime before 1467, at which level it remained for the remainder of the fifteenth century, the rent still fell far short of the previous extent.[92] Similarly, the lands of Kinnethmont and Bochrum in Banffshire were leased for a rent of £10 annually throughout the fifteenth century, but they were valued at £20 according to the 'old extent'.[93]

However, from the mid fifteenth century until around 1500, both the farms included in the gross charge, recorded in the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra, and rents quoted in the king's rentals remained static in amount. Between 1455 and 1500 the gross farm from Ettrick forest rose only £6 from the original total of £519-13-4, between 1457 and 1500 the rent derived from the lordship of Galloway also rose only £6 while that of Stewarton increased £4 between the same dates.[94] Such increases as there were tended to result from the inclusion of additional portions of land to the accountant's jurisdiction. Between 1480 and 1500 the rents recorded in the rental books reflected a similar disinclination to change. Despite the slightly improved economic situation in the mid fifteenth century, the demand for land was still not sufficient to enable the crown to step up rents to any substantial degree. It is possible that a considerable proportion of the rent increases and the inclusion of new estates within the scope of the property accounts were caused by attempts to cut down on the corruption and inefficiency of local officials undoubtedly prevalent during the minority of James II. During the reign

---

92. ER, vi, 270, vii. 456, xii, 666.

93. ER, v, 654-5

94. See Appendix No.B/2(a)

of James III the annual farms recorded in the rentals tended to remain static in amount, merely reflecting the details recorded in the previous rental books. The persistant preservation of the status quo in crown rents during the second half of the fifteenth century obviously took little cognizance of the changing economic situation and although there is little indication as to the relationship between rent levels and the true value of royal property in the first half of the fifteenth century, there can be little doubt that the gulf must have widened during the second half in the more prosperous estates. It may be surmised that it was deliberate royal policy to protect rents from the vicissitudes of economic movements, especially during a period of overall stagnation, in order to achieve, at least in theory, a fixed, calculable return from royal property. However, the fact that, in the fifteenth century, royal rents rended to remain fixed in amount undoubtedly reflected the lack of demand for leases. The declining or, at best, static population level in Scotland at this period resulted in more land being available with an inadequate supply of tenants to fill the vacancies. Even late in the century, commissioners frequently completed their task with considerable areas left unlet. It was not uncommon for mysterious gaps to appear in the rentals and in 1502, following the grassum total for the quarter of Falkland in Fife, it was stated that the lands of Balbreky, Auldhall, Bernturk and Markinch were not leased while the 1499 lease of the earldom of Strathearn mentioned that the lands of Rathern, Mill of Nab and Glenshee were also vacant.[95]

The rent levied from different portions of land varied considerably in nature. The lordship of Bothwell, for instance, was leased for a cash rent only,[96] and the rental for the earldom of Strathearn contained only one entry in kind, the farm of Drumquharagan for 8 bolls of beer and

---

95. ER, xi, 423, xii, 618.

96. ER, ix, 577.

48 poultry.[97] Concerning grain farms, most portions of royal property were assessed according to the size and yield of the land in question and also according to the amount of farm that was submitted in cash, but the rental of the earldom of Strathearn contained a memorandum which stated that every 10 marks of land within the earldom was assigned to submit one mart annually.[98] Most of crown estates were leased for rents paid partly in cash and partly in kind. The most common kind farms were wheat, oats, barley, oatmeal, beer, capons, poultry, marts and mutton, and although rendered in detail in the king's rentals, the annual accounts sometimes omitted to include such items as poultry and capons. Some rents were paid in more unusual forms, for the lands of Kintyre included in their rental such items as cheese and pigs,[99] while in the lordship of Brechin rents included 12 horse shoes, and 500 dried fish.[100] Fish, mainly salmon and herring, was also a common means of submitting rent. The fishing of the Spey, included in the rental of the earldom of Moray, was let for a varying amount of salmon,[101] while the letter of lease of the Assise Herring 'takyn at the west sey and lowis of the sammyn' to Peter Colquhoun, lasting for 9 years, bound the grantee to pay 4 lasts of herring annually, of 'gud and sufficient stuff for the kingis houshald, berrellit and weil saltit', to be delivered, free of charge, to the burgh of Glasgow annually on the 8 of January, or sooner if he was required to.[102]

On the renewal of a lease, a grassum, equivalent, in theory, to one years rent was due to the crown. On the entry of a new tenant to a particular lease, he was also bound to submit an entry fine, which tended

---

97. ER, ix, 570.
98. ER, xi, 419.
99. ER, xii, 577
100. ER, ix, 577
101. ER, xi, 434, xii, 669. RSS, i, 682.
102. RSS, i, 1585.

to vary considerably in amount, but was often calculated at half the annual rent. These exaction were nearly always paid in cash, but the entry fine of William Marsar to the land of Drumberry, Petcathly Bymeane and Cassoquhy, in the lordship of Methven in 1502 was calculated at one copper kettle containing 140 gallons or £10 at the discretion of the comptroller.[103] These exaction were only liable from tenants of leased land, those who occupied the land by some other method of retained the land in their possession through assignation or gift or as payment for certain services, were not required to submit to such demands. Although the annual rent due from a lease was invariably paid to the crown, through the "Ballivi ad Extra", the payment of grassums and entries did not always follow this precedent. From 1458, the chamberlain of Galloway was charged with the collection of entries and grassums,[104] and large amounts were recorded for the years in which there was a general lease of the entire lordship, while, during the intermediate years, smaller, isolated returns were drawn either from land leased at a time other than the official lease, or from entries from new tenants. However, payment direct to the Receiver or Comptroller was also very common. The 1501 account of the lordship of Galloway recorded the employment of both methods of payment, for £130-16-8 of the grassums of certain named lands were charged to the chamberlain, who, after allowances, would then transfer the cash to the comptroller, while £421-2-4 was declared not charged to the chamberlain within his account, as the money involved had been paid directly to David Beaton, on behalf of the late sir Robert Lundy of Balgouny, then comptroller.[105] This last phrase reflected the king's desire for the quick payment of the grassum levies, for payment must have been made at the actual lease in July 1500 to David Beaton, thus removing the

---

103. ER, xii, 461.

104. Appendix No.B/3hfor details of the grassums payments to the chamberlain of Galloway.

105. ER, xi, 330-1.

chamberlain as the middle man. When the ownership of a lease was changed within the span of the original contract it was normallfor the new tenant to receive admission at the exchequer and the entry due was immediately paid directly to the comptroller on the day.[106] However variations in this procedure did occur, for at the reletting of £1-16-8 worth of the land of Darwhillinghill in the Lordship of Kilmarnock, the entry demanded amounted to £3, of which £1 was paid to sir John Stirling of Cragbarnard in his capacity as Steward of the King's Household, and the remainder was to be paid by next Easter or at the Synod of Glasgow.[107]

Although in theory the rental was to provide the crown with a steady, calculable source of revenue, royal rents tended to remain static in value, except in return for a longer lease or feu to the tenant, but grassums presented the crown with a more fluid arrangement. Theoretically the grassum was calculated as a year's rent but, during the course of the reign of James IV, the crown attempted to extract more from this source of revenue. Taking the earldom of Fife as an example, the grassums and entries extracted from the tenants for the three official leases during the reign of James III from 1480 amounted to £193, £160-17-4 and £193-6/- respectively, but by the lease of 1492, the total had risen to £308-7/-, and in the last two official leases before the Earldom was set in feu, namely in 1505 and 1508, the totals reached £440-5-8 and £373-9-8 respectively.[108] Although Galloway, before 1500 did not reveal such a dramatic increase in the grassums extracted, two points emerge from the figures quoted from this lordship, firstly that the total figures for

---

106. ER, xi, 418. New lease of ½land of Strongarvald which Finlay Feware had now leased by his death to Finlay McWallich, for the rest of Finlay Feware's lease, paying the usual rent, £1 entry fine, 'et iste introitus solvitur Johanni Strivelin istulatori dicto de'. The lease was arranged at the Exchequer on 6 June 1501 in the presence of the auditor.

107. ER, xi, 443.

108. ER, ix-xiii. See rentals of earldom of Fife.

grassums and entries, except for 1500, were always slightly higher than the total annual rent of the lands leased within the lordship and secondly the grassum total obiously depended on the amount of land that was relet at that particular time, for although the grassum total for the lease of royal estates within Galloway in March 1488-9 only amounted to £220-5/-, the annual rent of the land relet on that occasion totalled only £203.10/-.[109] In some areas in the lordship of Galloway, the grassum demanded was greater than the annual rent. The lands of Largs and Talolagarth were let for an annual rent of £4 each, but the grassum amounted to £6 each.[110] There was considerable variation in the level of grassum charged from year to year, but in only a few cases did the crown suffer any permanent decline. There were individual cases of dramatic rises in the grassums for example the tenants of the lands of Murdocairny in the earldom of Fife were required to pay a grassum of £8 in March 1481-2, by 1487 it had risen to £10, and from 1492 onwards a grassum of £20 was being levied.[111] There was considerable variation in the relationship between the amount of rent charged and the extent of the grassum. It can be assumed that where the grassum levy tended to rise, often to a rate higher than the annual rent, that there was considerable demand for the leases of that particular area. Since the grassum seems to have been a more flexible levy than the rent, the level of competition for royal leases was reflected in the size of the grassum total. It is probable that the lands in Fife and Galloway, with their high grassum rates, represented areas in

---

109. ER, ix-xii. See rentals of lordship of Galloway

Date of Lease	Land Leased	Grassums
Mar. 1481-2	£332- 0-8	£372-16-4
Mar. 1488-9	£203-10/-	£220- 5/-
Dec. 1490	£367-3-4	£482-0-0
Mar. 1492-3	£447-0-0	£572-2/-
July 1500	£498-14-4	£415-18/-

110. ER, ix, 582-3

111. ER, ix, 587, 651, x, 713

which there was a considerable demand for crown leases. In the barony of Skeoch the demand was obviously less dramatic, for until the lease of 1486, many of the grassums levies lagged behind the level of rent and even when brought up to a similar level in 1486, they remained at that point until 1508.[112] However, at the other end of the scale, the lands of Luthrie in the earldom of Fife, assessed at a rent of £53-6-8 annually witnesses only a minute rise in their grassum assessment for between 1480 and 1511 it increased from £26-13-4 to £30. That the king could enforce the payment of a higher grassum could be seen in the lease of the lands Mill and Greenhouse, Balgarvie, Rothulit, within the earldom of Fife, in which the grassum was quoted at £20 with the accompanying threat that if the tenant, Sir Alex Lindsay of Auchtermonse refused the grassum he was to vacate the lease.[113]

It was customary, even when leasing a portion of property for a lengthy tenure, to levy the grassum at the outset of the tenancy, but in the lands of Cameron, in Fife, leased for 9 years, the grassum was due every three years at the equivalent to a year's rent.[114] Although the leasees, Rose Arnot and her son John Abercrombie, were in receipt of the security benefits of a 9 year lease, the crown was anxious not to forgo the triennial grassum which would have been due had the property been let for the term of 3 years, as was customary in the earldom of Fife. Any consideration of the fiscal potential of the grassum was bound up with the frequency in which royal estates were relet. The normal 3 year lease resulted in a grassum levy being due to the crown more frequently than if the lands were let for a period of 5 years. It is not surprising, therefore, that, although the crown was prepared to tolerate the longer lease, as mentioned in various instructions given to commissioners, the

---

112. ER, ix, 568, 600. x, 667, 732, 757. xi, 410, xii 638, 680.
113. ER, xii, 687.
114. ER, xi, 427, xii, 617, 688.

shorter lease was encouraged since it brought greater financial return.

However, there,were, for a variety of reasons, several examples of the remission of grassums. The most common was associated with the doubling of the rent, and, in the lease of the earldom of Strathearn in 1502, the vast majority of the tenants had their grassums remitted 'quia levatur ad duplicem firmam', butthe tenants of Kinkell were charged the usual grassum of £32 'as the lands had been previously raised to a double farm by the late Sir David Dunbar'.[115] In the 1500 lease of Galloway, John Mure and Elizabeth Hamilton, his wife, were remitted £2-3-4 of the total grassum of £6-10/- for the lands of Clauchrie for their work in collecting farms.[116] Although such allowances were necessary in lands badly affected by natural disasters, or sterility and also lands for which it was difficult to find tenants, there can be little doubt that many tenants were willing to paint as black a picture of the state of the property as was possible in order to gain these remissions. Andrew, lord Avondale was remittedhis grassum of £40 due from the lands of Drummond in 1480, 'ex eo quod excolat', since he was cultivating the lands with his own goods,[117] while from 1486 to 1499 the tenants of the lands of Deidhope in Ettrick forest paid no grassum, firstly through waste, secondly since the earl of Bothwell claimed that they were not accustomed to submit a grassum, and thirdly through the sterility of the ground.[118] The tenants of Burnhouse were not required to pay a grassum for the lease of 1492, since the land was declared 'since the land was partly covered with sand and buildings destroyed'.[119] If the tenant undertook to carry out repairs on the land, he tended to be encouraged by remission of a grassum, which was the method employed to repay Simon Kirkcaldy when he

---

115. ER, xii, 624-9.
116. ER, xi, 455.
117. ER, ix, 562.
118. ER, x, 714.
119. ER, ix, 616; x, 677, 736.
120. ER, xii, 618.

built the mill for the lands of the Mill of Lumquhat in 1502.[120]

In addition to the cash and kind returns from rent, grassums and entry fines, the majority of royal tenants were required to render further services for their leases. In the 'Rentalia Domini Regis' the entry merely stated the stock phrase 'cum servicio et cariagiis consuetis'. Since, in the fifteenth century, the Scottish crown did not engage in extensive demesne cultivation, the customary labour services due from neighbouring tenants were not demanded. The general European trend in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries involved the steady commutation of earlier labour services into money rents as the fall in demand for agricultural produce rendered the extensive cultivation of demesne land unprofitable. Such demesne cultivation as still existed in the later Middle Ages came to depend increasingly on hired labour. In 1456, for instance, £29 was paid from the revenue of Methven for the expenses of the cultivation of the king's grange at Methven, in mowing, harrowing, enclosing the meadow, and harvesting,[121] while the chamberlain of Fife received an annual allowance of £16-13-4 for expenses of harvesting the hay from the meados of Falkland and Auchtermuchty.[122] However, other encumbrances were still demanded from royal tenants. Among the various services and dues levelled on royal tenants were the right of carriage, conveying the lord's goods at the tenant's expense, average, an unknown duty but normally in conjunction with the right of carriage, bludewite, a fine levied on bloodshed, hereiot, the best living animal belonging to the tenant claimed by the lord on the former's death, multure, a proportion of grain extracted by the lord on the compulsory grounding of corn at his mill, and merchet, a payment by an unfree tenant on

---

120. ER, xii, 618.

121. ER, vi, 282, 565. In 1456 5 chalders, 13 bolls, 1 firlot and 1 peck of oats and 7 bolls, 1 filot of barley was sown on the grange of Methven and 24 oxen were also purchased to work on the grange.

122. ER, vi, 80.

the occasion of his daughter's marriage. These exactions reflected the unfree status of royal tenants and revealed that although money rents were now being accepted by the crown, the contract between the king and his tenants was still far from being a commercial transaction. Such services were only due from husbandmen or those actually engaged in the cultivation of the property. If they were the immediate tenants of the crown, the benefit and profit from these exactions was submitted to the Ballivi ad Extra or some other royal representative but should the particular estate form part of a larger lease granted by the crown to a person who was then set between the small tenants and the crown, the profit from these impositions formed part of his 'holding'. The letter of tack granted to William Forbes of Tollis concerning the lordship of Garioch specified his right to the profit from hunting, halking, fishing, average, carriage, heriot and the suit of the tenants and inhabitants within the lordship.[123] In England, France and the Low Countries the interaction of an improved economic position and the continuing existance of these irksome services and duties resulted in the violent peasant reaction of the English peasant's revolt of 1381, the French Jacquerie of th 1350s and various other disturbances. Even in Scotland grievances were being aired. In February 1489-9 Parliamentary statutes recorded a complaint 'To the king and his consale be his pure tennentis, malaris and inhavitantis his propir landis in diuerse partis of his realme that thai are gretly hurt and oppressit be lordis and gentilmen of the cuntre duelling besid thaim quhilkis has na tak of our soverance lord of thair landis constranzeis and compellis thaim to do seruice, aurage carriage schering ledding lauboring ridding and trawelling be thare poweris and authoriteis'.[124] It is difficult to ascertain the stringency of their application although there is evidence of the levying of

---

123. RSS, i, 1724.

124. APS, ii, 222.

the heriot. In 1456 Master David Stewart, chamberlain of royal property north of the Spey was quoted as receiving three horses and two oxen from five heriots.[125] Towards the end of the fifteenth century this exaction tended to be commuted to cash. On the entry of Christine, widow of John Thompson, to a portion of the lands of Drumfingall in the earldom of Strathearn on 18 October 1486, a heriot of £1 was levied on John's death.[126] As with other levies, the crown was compelled to temper its desire for greater revenue with economic reality and several heriot demands were remitted.[127]

However, in estates owned by the crown, there was a demand for the commutation of these services and duties during the second half of the fifteenth century. The increasing desire for a more commercial contract resulted in the gradual disappearance of these exactions. In the 1480 lease of the lands of Two Kinkells in Strathearn to John Young and Thomas of Dunbarton, which was granted for the term of 19 years, the yearly rent amounted to 24 marks in cash 'alanerly for all uther service exaccioun questioun or demand that may be askit or requirit fo the saide landis'.[128] The introduction of feuing in royal property resulted in the further removal of many of these claims. The 'reddendo' attached to feu charters generally made no mention of these various services, the cash farm tended to be all inclusive, although it was common for multure payments to remain a separate levy.[129]

Individual leases contained additional conditions of tenure. In the Galloway lease of 1500, the tenatns of several portions of royal property

---

125. ER, vi, 218.

126. ER, ix, 636.

127. ER, xii, 278.

128. ER, ix, 120.

129. RMS, ii, 3407.

were required to perform military service to the crown with either an armoured lancer or two archers.[130] On 18 April 1500-1 sir Andrew Wood of Largo was granted the lease of the Mains of Dunbar and included in his 'reddendo' along with the rent of 30 chalders of wheat and the same quantity of barley, was the provision that he 'sall hald daily on his expens' for the duration of the 9 year lease, 'xii ꝛufficiant men within the said castell (Dunbar) for the keping thairof, and mak jevellouris and wachmen'.[131] On 17 March 1503-4 Alexander Gordon of Midmar received a 5 year lease of the lands of Strathdee and Cromar for 'the penny male .... for al uther service ...and providing that he sal nocht hew of sell nagrene wod of the said woddis as he wil ansuere to the king thairapoun'.[132]

The lands of Urquhart, in the earldom of Fife, were, in April 1487, leased to George Muncrieff for 20 marks annually through royal letters under the privy seal, with the additional memorandum that the previous farmers of the lands, as mentioned in the old rentals, performed the office of custodian of the king's 500 sheep, 'freely without payment'.[133]

Occasionally a new portion of land or a new mill was added to the king's rental. By the end of the fifteenth century the population must have recovered sufficiently to create a demand for a letting of new regions. In the 1492 lease of the lands of the earldom of Menteith, there is the first record of the Mill of Kippen, which, was leased to Archibald Edmonstone for the term of three years, To ensure the necessary capital to cover the costs of the building and improving of the mill, Archibald Edmonstone was allowed freedom form all farms and grassums for the period of the lease, and

---

130. ER, xi, 451-6.

131. RSS, i, 672.

132. RSS, i, 1026.

133. ER, ix, 654.

although he was required to pay an annual rent of 8 bolls of oatmeal under the terms of the 1495 lease, still no grassum was levied.[134] The tenant was given sufficient financial incentive in the way of remissions in order to develope his acquisition which, in turn, would eventually profit the crown through regular rents and grassums. To ensure that Archibald gained sufficient return from his investment to be able to pay his rent in full, and additional memorandum was entered, stating that the tenants of Kippen were bound to the mill for the grinding of their corn, for which they paid the customary dues of multure and sequels, in the same way as other tenants of the earldom were attached to other mills.[135] The family of Edmonstone retained the lease of the mill for a long period and continued to submit the stated rent suggesting that it represented a profitable investment for both the crown and the Edmonstones.[136] The Mill of Drumtarf in the lordship of Methven was, in 1480, leased to Alexander Pollok for £14 annually, with the condition that he was to return the multure and service of the tenants of Methven, as he had enjoyed when he first held the mill, if not, the rental was to be reduced.[137]

Information concerning the nature of estate divisions and the relative value of different holdings is unfortunately confined to certain royal estates in Stirlingshire and Ballincrieff. Most of the crown property recorded in the king's rentals was merely divided into named regions, each of which was assigned an annual rent. To know that the lands of Kingscavil within the lordship of Linlithgowshire was assessed for an annual farm of £25-6-8, 1 chalder of oats, 24 capons and the same number of poultry, conveyed very little as to the relative value of the estate in question as compared with

---

134. ER, x, 722, 760.

135. Sequels, consisted of small parcels of corn or meal given as a fee to the servants, over and above the multure: Jamesons' Scottish Dictionary, supplements, ii, 365.

136. ER, xii, 633.

137. ER, ix, 576.

Other areas of royal property especially as the rent sought by the crown probably bore little resemblance as to the actual value of the land. As explained later in this chapter, it is reasonable to assume that property divided into small portions were potentially more profitable than those leased in large blocks and it is from the former that most of the information concerning estate divisions can be derived. Divisions recorded in the king's rentals varied from region to region. Within the earldom of Fife, estates were divided according to fractions, in March 1481-2 the lands of Balbreky, leased at £4, 1 chalder, 4 bolls of barley, 2 chalders, 8 bolls of oats and 24 capons, were let to a single tenant, Alexander Ramsey, the mill of Lunquhat was divided between two tenants, the lands of Ardate were split into portions of a quarter, one eighth and one sixteenth, Easter Dron was divided into sixths, ninths and eighteenths while the smallest portions within the Newtown of Falkland amounted to only one thirty-second. In contrast, the lands of Ferryfield and Bonefield were sub-divided into fragments according to the amount of rent paid by each tenant, for instance William Cowper held a section of property leased for 16/10d annually while the share retained by John Newton's wife as let for only 1/9d.[138] The lands of Kintyre were divided into marklands, a monetary division in accordance with an assessment of the property at some specific date and which tended to remain in operation even after the lands had been revalued. This represented a further example of the conservative nature of the Scottish accounting system for, in 1506, the lands of Mongastill in Kintyre were termed as five marklands yet submitted an annual farm of £5.[139]

In the rentals, crown property within the lordship of Stirlingshire divided into bovates. Following the introduction of the land-gavel system

---

138. ER, ix, 587-591.

139. ER, xii, 706.

of agricultural division, the basic unit of land became the ploughgate of carucate, assessed at 104 acres. The bovate or oxgang was calculated as the work share of a single ox on land ploughed by a team of 8 oxen in the course of a year, that is, one eight of a ploughgate or 13 acres. Cosmo Innes, quoting 1585 decree of the Exchequer, stated that it was decided that 'four oxgair of the said lands extendis and sall extend to ane pund land of the old extent in all time to cum'.[140] However, the Halls of Airth comprised of over 32 bovates or 418 acres while the grange of Bothkennar at $27\frac{1}{2}$ bovates was composed of 348 acres. The rent attached to a bovate of crown land within Stirlingshire varied according to the nature of payment, namely the proportion of cash to kind. For instance, a single bovate within the Halls of Airth seems to have been calculated at an annual farm of 17/6d plus $1\frac{3}{4}$ capons, that is roughly 1/7 an acre, whereas in the grange of Bothkennar a bovate contributed 16/- in cash and 1 boll of wheat, 2 bolls of barley and 2 capons in kind.[141] Within the barony of Skeoch, each bovate fetched an annual farm of £1, 1 boll of bere and 6 poultry. From this assessment, it would appear that a greater yield was achieved by the crown from the lands of Bothkennar than the Halls of Airth. The lands of Ballincrief provided the best example of the organization and value of a fifteenth century estate under the control of the crown. The demesne lands of Ballincrief, of which there is no indication of the actual size, was divided into four sections and leased for a total of £30 and 10 chalders of wheat while the village was subdivided into $13\frac{1}{2}$ husbandlands, a division which represented a quarter of a ploughgate or two bovates. Each husbandland was leased for an annual return of £2-6-8, 3 capons and 6 poultry, which amounted to approximately 1/10d an acre. Compared with valuation of 17/6d and $1\frac{3}{4}$ capons a bovate for the Halls of Airth, the village of Ballincrieff,

---

140. Innes, Lectures on Scotch Legal Antiquities, 283.

141. ER, ix, 567-8.

calculated at £1-3-4, 1½ capons and 3 poultry, seem to provide a great return to the crown but it is more doubtful if the latter was of greater value than the lands of Bothkennar. In additon, the village supported 27 cottage holdings, each providing a return of 3/- and 3 poultry, smithyland leased for a rent of 5/-, a brewary, let for 13/4d, and a mill, from which the crown extracted an annual farm of £5-6-8.[142]

In crown property, as in most other holdings, arable land was cultivated under the rather wasteful infield and outfield system. The infield portion usually formed the best and most conveniently situated section of land and was kept constantly under cultivation with a verying sequence of crops. The rest of the land, termed outfield, was only cropped intermittently and tended to comprise of land on the higher reached of hill slopes or in the more moorish parts of the estate. These areas were cultivated as long as the yield made it profitable but when this ceased to be the case, that portion was usually abandoned to grass until the fertility was restored to a level sufficient to justify the return to crop cultivation. In theory, attempts were made to ensure that each cultivator retained a share of both the good and the bad. Each tenant was allocated rigs scattered usually in sequence, throughout the estate encompassing both fertile and infertile areas. The cultivation of the estate was, by necessity, a composite effort, the use of a plough team being divided among the various tenants and the rigs were ploughed in sequence to ensure that no one retained any advantage, through the early ploughing of his portion.[143]

Various rights could be attached to the lease, which, if granted, were recorded in the lease itself and somtimes in the king's rentals.

---

142. ER, ix, 579-80.

143. For further details concerning the cultivation of Mediaeval estates in Scotland, see Symon, Scottish Farming, 1-33.

George Burnett, in his introduction to Volume IX of the 'Exchequer Rolls of Scotland' maintained that 'to assign or sublet was generally prohibited: but there are special permissions to do so given to favoured tenants, like Guthre of that Ilk, the bishop of Dunkeld, lord Avondale, and his nephew Drummond of Cargill and Patrick Erskine.'[144] Possibly this statement may have been meant to cover only the scope of that particular volume, but later rentals and leases quoted in the Register of the Privy Seal revealed the existance of numerous examples of subletting or assignation of leases. As stated by Burnett, such grants were gifted to 'favoured tenants' and men in power,[145] as his examples revealed, but as the movement towards longer leases in the reign of James IV, the right of subletting and assignation was frequently granted in association with the long lease. Such concession normally presented the leasee with greater control over the composition of and the terms arranged with, his sub-tenants. These were mostly husbandmen or cottars who actually cultivated the soil and were each apportioned a section of the lease. If the right of sublet was not included in the terms of the lease, presumably the sub-tenants were largely under the control of the crown or those engaged in the leasing of the estate. In the lease of the earldom of Moray in 1511, Walter Dynnard, in receipt of a 4 year lease of a third of the lands of Kincorf at an annual rent of £2, was granted the power to sublet while Robert Rankin, leasee of a quarter of the lands of Little Tary, was ordered not to remove tenants not extract more from them than quoted in the rental.[146] On 13 October 1506 the tack of the lands of Strathdee and Cromar was granted to Alexander, earl of Huntly for the period of 7 years 'to be haldin... to the said Alexander and his assignais and subtennentis for all the zeris forsaid... with power to output and imput subtennentis, ane or maa' and he was also constituted baillie within the

---

144. ER, ix, xxxiv.

145. ER, ix, 562, 575, 577, 636, 642, 647.

146. ER, xiii, 594-5.

lands in the lease.[147] On 6 January 1508-9 John Grant of Fruchie was presented with a 9 year lease of the lands of Urquhart and Glenmoriston 'with the power to mak subtenentis.. with fre ischey and entre' and he also received the power to hold court within the jurisdiction of the lease, to punish tresspassers, and raise the various fines and unlaws for his own benefit.[148] Powers such as these tended to be gifted to those who were in receipt of fairly lengthy tacks which encompassed large blocks of royal property. The sub-tenants referred to in tacks of this size would probably not have been the actual tillers of the soil but the class of small landowners below the laird. However, such concessions and privileges not only augmented the leasee's power over the property under his temporary control but also must have greatly increased his scope for substantial financial gain. However, such grants adopted various forms. In the lease of the lordship of Apnadull in 6 June 1508 for the term of five years to Robert Menzies of that ilk, it was stated that he was leased the lands 'with power to occupy thaim with thair awne gudis or to set thaim in all or in parte to tenentis under thaim', this giving him the element of choice.[149] Under the terms of such a grant, the tenant was permitted either to sub-let his holding or to engage in the direct cultivation of the estate using hired labour and selling the produce to pay for the rent. Some leases were more restrictive, as in the letting of half the lands of Two Kinkellis to John Ramsey and Isabelle Cant, his wife, in 1484, where it was recorded that the lands were leased 'with power to the saidis Johne and Isabell his spouse and the langest levare of thame two thare ayeris and assignayis to mak subtennandis and cotaris under thame ane or maa in the half of the saidis landis, enduring the termes foresaid like as thai think maist expedient and

---

147. RSS, i, 1344

148. RSS, i, 1793

149. RSS, i, 1688.

proffitable for thaim'.[150] This lease shows up two significant points, firstly, the right of the leassee, if so granted in their lease, to make over his or her lease to an assignee, explained in greater detail in the grant of the lease of Largo to Andrew Wood of Leith in 1477, 'and to his assignayis ane or maa..... quharefore we charge straitly and commandis all and sindri oure leigis and subditis foresaide and in speciale oure ressavouris, chaumerlanis, and intromettouris, that nen of yow tak uppoun hand to mak ony impediment letting or distrublance to ye siade Andro his assignayis subtennandis servandis and intromettouris in the broiking joising occupying and manuring of the saidis landis'.[151] Secondly, as the lands of the crown were leased with the definite intention of deriving the greatest profit, in the same way, it was permitted to the tenant of the crown, provided he paid the stated rent and other dues to the king's collectors, to extract the greatest profit from the lands he had in lease. The crown lessee acted as the middle link in the collection of the crown rent, he extracted a rent from his subtenants, and paid an annual contribution to the 'Ballivi ad Extra' as laid down in the rental books, As well as rent, the lessee was entitled to other items of profit as recorded in his lease, Alexander, lord Gordon, in his lease of lands within the earldom of Moray was allowed 'al proffitis and commoun pastour in the Forest of Ternway and Drummund', while the lease to William Forbes of Tollis of the lands of Garrioch mentioned that he also retain the lease of the mills, 'with the toll bere, forestis, woddis, boggis and medowis' and the lands were held with 'hunting, halking, fisching, arerage, careage, herezeldis and suite of the tenendis inhabitantis and saidis landis, and with all and sindry utheris comoditeys'.[152] All these ancillery benefits

---

150. ER, ix, 255-6.

151. ER, viii, 450.

152. RSS, i, 246, 172A

were designed to augment the lessee's profit from the area included in his letter of tack. It is unfortunate, that surviving records give little insight into the workings and administration of crown lands below the level of the crown lessee. However, on 12 September 1510 the lands of Easterbin within the earldom of Moray were leased to James Kennedy for an annual farm of £6, 1 mart, 1 mutton, 3 bolls of oats and 2 capons for 3 years on the condition that the sub-tenants were in agreement and that he extracted from them no more than that which he paid to the crown. It would appear that Kennedy had not complied with the conditions set out in the lease since, on 9 June 1511, the treasurer 'tuk ane note that the tenentis wald nocht consent nor be content that James Kennedy had this tak'.[153] Also in 1510 Robert Rankin was granted the lease of the lands of Lambride and Walkmilton in Moray for 3 years, paying an annual farm according to rent recorded in the rental books, provided that he satisfied the tenants and, on 9 June the following year, a memorandum recorded that Gerald Innes, presumably the representative of the sub-tenants, 'consentit that sir Robert Rankin had this tak'.[154] The muniments of Broughton and Cally record the attempts of Master William Lennox of Caly to make the maximum profit out of his lease. On the 27 October 1484, the lands of Balgreggan and half the lands of Kirkandrews along with other lands were leased to Master William Lennox of Caly for five years after the death of Catherine, Lady Moneypenny.[155] In an instrument in the hand of James Porter, dated 17 May 1485, it was stated that Willima McGhe of Plumton and John Smerles, as agents of Master William, were ordered to inhibit the husbandmen, tenants and inhabitants of the kings lands of Kirkandrews, from occupying, labouring or inhabiting the lands after the Monday after Whitsunday,

---

153. ER, xiii, 592.

154. ER, xiii, 593.

155. ER, ix, 593.

with the penalty of 4 marks for every markland they occupied after that date.[156] Following, on the 30 May, the above William and John, were given the power by Master William to let the lands of Balgreggan and to offer the tenants John, Patrick, and Thomas Thompson and John Williamson the lease of the lands in question at the rate of 28 marks annually with a grassum of £14, and on their refusal of the terms, the agents were instructed to inhibit them from ploughing, sowing or occupying the lands. For the lands of Balgreggan in the king's rental, Master William was required to pay a rental of 14 marks only, with a grassum of £14 and the above entry demonstrated his attempt to extract double the rent from his subtenants.[157] As to the result of this confrontation, there is no further record.[158] On the 24 November 1505, there is a record of Master William assembling the tenants of the barony of Kirkandrews at the kirk of the same, and asking them jointly how much he could take from them in rents and profit, and they replied, with one voice, that the laird was entitled to only half of the rents of the barony.[159] Although certain subtenants seem to have successfully resisted the rack renting activities of these middle men, there is no evidence that such complaints were upheld by the crown on a large scale. During the reign of James IV, the tendancy was for the crown to opt out of the administrative difficulties involved in the task of collecting its own revenue from royal property. It was common for many of the larger lessees to retain the office of baillie or Ballivi ad Extra, as was the case with William, earl of Errol, lessee of the lordship of Brechin and Nevar, being directly responsible to the Auditors of the Exchequer for the gross

---

156. SRO, Broughton and Cally Muniments, G.D. 10/969
157. Ibid, G.D. 10/970.
158. By 1490, the lease had passed to the earl of Bothwell, and never returned to Master William Lennox. ER, x, 701.
159. Ibid, 971. In the lease, the lands involved included only half the barony of Kirkandrews, let at 20 marks, and later at the proper rent of £20, and although, in the rolls, the lands were stated to be granted to sir John Ramsey for life, although Master William probably retained the lease. ER, iv, 593, xii, 15, 253, 350, 460, 567.

farm as detailed in the letter of lease.[160] The middle man's control over subletting and his right to pursue unco-operative tenants suggested that the crown's interest ended with the annual payment of the agreed farm and that there would probably have been little royal interference into the actual running of the estate. It is only logical to assume that these tackmen made a considerable profit from their investment since the trend was for such arrangements to florish. In a letter of indenture, dated 2 May 1501, between the king and the commissioners for the burgh of Engin, over the lease of the fishing of the Spey, 'fra Ordquhische to the sey', let to the latter by the king, a proviso was inserted 'that it sla nocht be leful to the said fermoris to set ony parte of the said fischingis to maisterful ment outdwellairs of the said burgh, under the pane of tynsale of thare takkis'.[161] The terms of the lease made it clear that the full restrictivemess of the monopoly retained by the royal burgh was to be maintained in the subletting of parts of the lease.

Although there was little variation in the administration and organization of royal property in the later Middle Ages, an important exception was provided by Ettrick forest. While most of the royal holdings were largely under the plough, the forest of Ettrick, in accordance with its hilly terrain, tended to concentrate on the rearing of sheep and cattle with arable farming limited to the more fertile valleys. The annual farms extracted from this region reflected this trend, for, before the kind returns were removed from the rent in 1501, the annual gross income from the entire forest amounted to £525-13-4 in cash and 86½ bowky, 111 ('fog and fule' marts and 800 lambs.[162] The term 'forest' in the crown rentals of the late

---

160. RSS, i, 1612. ER, xiii, 74, 135, 333

161. RSS, i, 682.

162. ER, ix, 414-21. A bowky or bowcow was a cow belonging to a farm stock. The fog mart represented a cow fed on grass left in the field during winter, but a fule mart is an uncertain beast. Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue.

fifteenth century was a purely legal designation indicating simply that the lands in question had, in the part, been given the privilege of a royal forest, presumably when the region was more lavishly endowed with wooded areas. The lands of Ettrick, Yarrow and Tweed were, therefore, subject to the forest laws on hawking, hunting, the cutting of green wood and free passage. Although certain wooded areas still remained the 'forest' referred primarily to hunting as performed by the earls of Douglas, holders of the lands in the fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth centuries, and the crown before and after the Douglas interlude. However, there is little evidence of extensive forestation, as must have been the case in earlier times.

For administration purposes, the forest was divided into three wards, Ettrick, Yarrow and Tweed, each under the control of two officials, the master ranger and the ranger, both of whom were in receipt of the annual farm from one stead as their official fee. Until 1498 accounts for the three wards were rendered separately by the rangers. The office of master ranger and ranger was normally held by a member of a prominant local family, the Scotts, Pringles or Humes.[163] Ultimate responsibility for the administration of the forest rested with the baillie. Further, each ward was divided into various 'steads' or 'places', Within the ward of Ettrick there were 45½ steads whereas within Tweed and Yarrow only 17 and 23 respectively were recorded. Each stead was leased for a rent of £6 and a fixed number of sheep and cattle. Within the wards of Yarrow and Tweed there were references to a 'hamlot' or a quarter stead while a 'bondelsoure' or a ninth of a stead was recorded within the latter ward. As well as submitting an annual rent in return for their holding, tenants of the forest were also required to provide 'twa bowis and a sper with hors and ger' for military service to the crown and also owed suit to the forest court, usually held

---

163. ER, x, 601, xi, 7, 9.

twice a year at Beltane and All Hallows (1 May and 1 November). Originally these courts were presided over by the chancellor, comptroller and clerk of the forest but towards the end of the fifteenth century, royal commissioners, appointed by the crown, were responsible for their administration. They tended to deal with breaches of the forest laws, namely hawking, hunting, 'ditching and dyking', cutting green wood and hunting without leave.[164]

Attached to the 1499 general lease of Etrrick Forest, there was a series of statements concerning the forest laws and the administration of the steads leased within the forest. This took the form of the 'the punctis to be inquirit at the Inqueist', followed by twelve items, partly in reply to the 'punctis', detailing new statutes relating to the forest, which, along with the 'auld statutis of the forrest', were to provide a guide for the efficient running of these lands.[165] The majority of the items were concerned with the preservation of the forest woods and game, such as deer, for hunting. There were statutes against a variety of activities, namely the slayers of calves, deer and other animals, the existance of trades likely to use quantities of wood like arrow makers, wrights, coalburners, coopers and the 'pelar of bafk', the selling of wood for profit and the wanton destroying or cutting of wood, grain farming, muirburn and the dyking of wood, all designed to 'kep the forrest forrestlike'. The severity of the punishments for transgressors was sufficient to demonstrate the seriousness of the king's attempt to preserve the timber and game of Ettrick Forest, since the loss of the stead holding and the escheat of the criminal's goods were frequent punishments. There were various other statutes intended to

---

164. For details of the physical make-up, the organization, the administration and the history of the forest of Ettrick, see The Royal Commission of Ancient Historical Monuments of Scotland, for Selkirkshire.

165. ER, xi, 393-5: Also for details, see Appendix. No. B/3(L)

increase the efficiency of the management of these steadings. The statutes also made mention the oppressors of the king's tenants, the omission of king's lands from the rental, the failure to pay rents and other dues, the marriage of widows without the royal licence, the efficiency and honesty of collectors of the king's revenue, and the letting of a stead only to a tenant willing to occupy the holding personally or through a sufficient subtenant.

In the following lease of Ettrick Forest in 1499, the tenant of Braidmedow, as would all the orther tenants, promised to observe the forest statutes detailed above under the penalties contained in the statutes.[166] Also mentioned in this lease were the first to suffer under the new statutes. It would appear that the criminal was allowed to compound for his crime, for Patrick Crichton, as tenant of the lands of Thornelee, suffered the loss of his stead for digging ditches and sowing seed 'pro forisfactura ejusdem per fossuram et seminacionem' and he only retained his lease with a composition of 20 wedders.[167] Even before the issue of these proclamations, the accounts of the three wards of Ettrick forest recorded the financial returns from the forest courts.[168] However the nature of the crimes involved are only revealed in the frequent remissions granted in the discharge. In the accounts of 1468 and 1469 William Douglas, warden of the March, gained a remission for a £400 fine levied for cutting 40 oaks which had been sent to Thomas Joffray, the Master of work at Newark Castle,[169] while in 1479, the Abbot of Melrose was remitted a fine of £180 for the cutting of 18 oaks.[170] This wanton cutting of trees, such as oak, for building purposes rapidly led to a considerable shortage of this commodity. Other crimes were also recorded, in 1474, James, earl of Buchan was remitted his fine of £40 for killing 4 deer,[171] in 1487, the abbot of Kelso received a remission of 20 marks.

---

166. ER, xi, 397
167. ER, xi, 401
168. Details in Ettrick Accounts
169. ER, vii, 525, 623.
170. ER, viii, 587
171. ER, viii, 208.

for the cutting of 'lentisci' to repair the monestary,[172] while Thomas Dickson and others were fined £2.10/- in 1478 for cutting greenwood.[173] As seen above; those who engaged in these illegal activities included the most powerful lay and ecclesiastical names.

The size of leases granted by the crown varied dramatically depending on the local circumstances. The wealth, status and political influence of royal tenants tended to be reflected in the size of the lease accepted from the crown. The breaking up of estates into small portions for the purpose of letting suggested that the returns were good enough to warrant such small holdings. This policy was normally adopted in the more prosperous regions of royal property, namely Fife, Stirlingshire, Menteith, Kinclaven, Ballincrieff and Linlithgowshire, in fact the central belt stretching down the east coast of Scotland from the Tay to just south of the Forth. For instance, during the reign of James III, the lands of Ferryfield and Bonefield within the earldom of Fife were let to 30 tenants for an aggregate annual rent of £10, the 16 bovates of the town of Blackness was divided amongst 14 tenants submitting a total farm of £15-1-4 while the $27\frac{1}{2}$ bovates of the grange of Bothkennar supported 12 tenants, who together contributed an annual rent of £18-16/- and a small quantity of corn and meal.[174] Even within these estates the size of holdings varied considerably. Within the grange of Bothkennar, Patrick Simpson held $4\frac{1}{2}$ bovates in lease, Alexander Mure and his son James, John Simpson and two brothers Patrick and David Kincaid retained holdings of 4 bovates, John Wilson held $2\frac{1}{2}$ bovates, William Simpson, Alexander Simpson and Richard Paterson were each let 2 bovates, William Paterson was in possession of $1\frac{1}{2}$ bovates and William Mathieson retained only a single bovate.

---

172. ER, ix, 472.
173. ER, xiii, 480.
174. ER, ix, 588, 633, 641.
175. ER, ix, 633.

Similar spreads were evident in most other royal estates within this central belt.[175] It was mostly in lands given the designation 'grange' or 'demesne land' ('terre dominice') that the largest lease divisions were found. It is likely that they formed the richest estates possessed by the crown and their high yield coupled with their nomenclature suggested that, in earlier centuries, they had formed the basis of the demesne retained in lord's possession and directly exploited for his own benefit. It is a fair assumption that many of these small tenants were in fact the actual tillers of the soil - in Ballincrieff they were actually termed husbandmen and cottars - although those with larger holdings probably enlisted the help of subtenants to cultivate their section of the estate. As long as regular supplies of rent and grassums flowed from these regions to the crown the status quo would be maintained and it was in the interest of these small tenants to deal directly with the crown's representative thus avoiding the increased inconvenience and cost of a middle man. However, in areas of less potential, the difficulties of collection and greater uncertainty as to the regular flow of rent compelled the crown to lease areas of royal property to middle men who submitted a fixed rent to the crown and were left to recompense themselves at the expense of the various sub-tenants and husbandmen. The desire for profit must have increased the tendancy to rack renting although, during the fifteenth century, the shortage of available tenants through the failure of the population to reveal signs of any significant increase, must have lessened the effect of such activities. In the rentals for the earldom of Strathearn, the various regions were let by the crown normally to one or two tenants. In 1486 the lands of Dundurn were leased to Finlay Philipson for an annual rent of £22 - although, because of the size of the lease he was granted the right to sublet - whereas the tofts of Drumfin were let in equal portions to John and William Murray each of which were responsible for

---

175. ER, ix, 633.

for half the total rent of 5 marks.[176] Although joint ventures in this type of royal lease tended to involve the division of the investment into even portions, in 1486, 5½ bovates of the lands of Bagrew in Stirlingshire, comprising of a total of 9½ bovates, were let to Archibald Menteith and his son William while John Thompson retained the lease of the remaining 4 bovates.[177] Investors in this type of lease tended to be mostly lairds, scions and younger sons of lairdly families and the landowning class between the lairds and husbandmen. In the 1480s large areas of royal property within Strathearn were leased to the Murrays of Trewin, of Abercairny, of Tulchadam and Tullibardine and various scions of these families, relatives of John Drummond of Cargill and lesser landholders like William Mason, John and Finlay Philipson and Robert Strogeith.[178]

However, towards the end of the fifteenth century, the tendancy was towards the formation of larger leases which had the effect of reducing the area of responsibility for the payment of rents and other dues payable from the property. This movement was in evidence even in parts of the royal demesne in central Scotland. In the interests of both administration and revenue, the crown found it expedient to lease large areas of royal property to local magnates and members of upper lairdly class. As mentioned already, these lessees were granted fairly wide powers within the area of their lease but the fixed rent attached to these settlements ensured a steady supply of income from those regions. This expedient was employed by James III in the case of the newly annexed lordships of Orkney and Shetland in 1472 when the entire property was let to Andrew, bishop of Orkney for life at an annual rent of £466-13-4.[179] It would appear that rent fixed in 1472 proved to be

---

176. ER, ix, 630-1.

177. ER, ix, 633.

178. ER, ix, 627-631.

179. ER, viii, 225, 275.

uneconomical, perhaps James was being too greedy and in 1475 it was reduced to £366-13-4, when the lands were let to William, bishop of Moray.[180] It is possible that James III was using the bishop of Moray as a foil in order to force the bishop of Orkney to accept the reduced terms of £366-13-4 which he did on 28 April 1478 when he was in receipt of a letter of lease quoting the same terms as those accepted by Moray whose letters were then revoked.[181] A feature of these leases was the extended length of the tenure, the bishop of Orkney originally received the lease of the lordships of Orkeny and Shetland for life, on 28 May 1489, Henry, lord Sinclair was in receipt of the same lease for 13 years and, on its renewal on 1 May 1501, a further term of 19 years was granted. However, the lengthening of the tenure was accompanied by an augmentation in the annual rent to 640 marks.[182] In 1483 the lands of Strathdee and Cromar were leased to Alexander Gordon of Midmar for an extra £16-16-8, which incidentally was to be allowed to him during his lifetime and the lands of Strathdon and Garioch were let to George, earl of Huntly for an annual rent of £350-3-4; the gross rent as charged to Alexander Leslie of Balcomy, chamberlain of Mar, in 1471 amounted to only £302-6-8.[183] On 17 March 1504-4 the lease of Strathdee and Cromar was renewed to Gordon of Midmar for a further five years and on his death the lease was transferred to Alexnader, earl of Huntly on 13 October 1506 for

---

180. ER, viii, 363, 453, 483.

181. ER, viii, 613. RMS, ii, 1376.

182. ER, viii, 225. RMS, ii, 1842, 2583. RSS, i, 681. On 29 May 1489 a letter of lease of the lordships of Orkney and Shetland was issued under the great seal to Patrick, earl of Bothwell, to endure for 13 years and containing similar terms to that granted to lord Sinclair the day before. The exact reasoning behind the additional letter is obscure, but it seems to have remained a dead letter since during the early years of the reign of James IV, lord Sinclair accounted annually at the Exchequer as lessee of Orkeny and Shetland. RMS, ii, 1845. ER, x, 89, 212.

183. ER, viii, 76, ix, 278-81, 385.

7 years at the same terms although the augmentation in the rent was now enforced.[184] During the reign of James IV this method of administering crown property in these regions florished. On 8 October 1498 the lands of the lordship of Abernethy were leased to John Grant of Freuchie for 9 years at the usual rent of £40 following the expiry of the 3 year lease of Robert Stewart of Clawalg. However, in February 1499-1500 the lease was apparently transferred to George, earl of Huntly for a similar period but the evidence suggests that Grant remained in possession of the lease and in 1509 and again in 1513 he received two renewals of his contract, each for the period of 5 years.[185] On 16 September 1502 the lordships of Urquhart and Glenmoriston were let to Grant of Freuchie for the period of 5 years at an annual farm of £100, of which £20 was allowed to him for his fee.[186] Within the earldom of Moray, on 8 October 1495 Alexander Innes of that Ilk received a 9 year lease of a substantial extent of property, including the fishing of the Spey.[187] The leasing of large blocks of royal property in the northern areas to powerful nobles and lairds was part of a more general policy of administering these remote regions through the agency of influencial figues whose position in the locality was further strengthened by royal gifts and appointments.

As in the realms of justice and administration, the king was forced to rely extensively on the earl of Huntly for supervision of the financial

---

184. RSS, i, 1026, 1344.

185. ER, xi, 763, xii, 659. RSS, i, 1888, 2497. Theletter of lease to the earl of Huntly was recorded in the Register of the Privy Seal, dated 3 February to endure for 9 years, but on 20 February, a similar lease was registered in the book of rentals but it was to last only for 3 years. RSS, i, 458. ER, xi, 434. But, from the evidence recorded in the Exchequer Rolls for the period following 1499-1500, it would appear that Grant did in fact continue to hold the lease as payments were made by him to the comptroller from the farms of Abernethy. ER, xii, 54, 287.

186. ER, xii, 659. RSS, i, 1793.

187. RSS, i, 56-7.

affairs of the crown in the North. For most of the reigns of James III and IV, the earl exercised considerable control over the administration of crown land in the north, for he frequently was involved in the leasing of the royal estates of Petty, Brackley, Strathdearn, Urquhart, Glenmoriston, Abernethy, Garioch, Invergarry, Glengarry and property within the earldoms of Moray and Mar, and not infrequently he held the lease of some of these lands himself.[188] In 1488, after Sauchieburn, it was recorded that Alexander, master of Gordon had been admitted to leases of the royal property of Strathdon, Garioch, Petty, Brackley and Strathdearn coupled with the offices of keeper of the royal strongholds of Inverness and Kildrummy by the late king the previous January.[189] Lands in the north were seldom leased without his presence and even when he was not directly involved, as in the lease of the lands of Lewis and Watterness, the commissioners, Ranald Alansoun of Elenbergeryn and Alexander MacLeod of Dunvegan, were instructed to 'tak zour informatioun and directioun of our traist cousing and counsalour Alexander erle of Huntlie, quham we have instrukit of our minde thareanent, and efter his informatioun, outputt, enter, and imput tenentis in the samyn landis in al gudely haist'.[190] In order that the earl's position might be made effective, he was granted various influencial positions under the crown. His power was augmented through commissions of justiciary for the lands north of the Forth,[191] appointment to the offices of sheriff of Inverness, Forress and Elgin,[192] and as keeper of the royal castles of Inverness, Redcastle and Kildrummy [193] and especially through the office of Lieutenant in the north.[194]

---

188. ER, x, 7, 26. : xi, 444, 446, xii, 128, 220, 349. See note 130, under earl of Huntly. RSS, i, 792, 1543, 1579.

189. ER, x, 7.

190. RSS, i, 1690.

191. Gordon Castle Miniments, Reg.No. 13/1/3.

192. Ibid, 9/2/1. : RSS, i, 1820. : RMS, ii, 3286. : ER xi, 332

193. Ibid, 9/2/1. : Innes, A Genealogical Deduction of the Family of Rose of Kilravock, 155-8. : ER, x, 7. : xi, 21, 157.

194. RMS, ii, 1212, 2036.

Since the normal financial machinery was often unable to enforce the efficient collection of the rents due to the crown, powerful barons like Huntly were employed. In an attempt to enforce the collection of rents of the lands of Lochaber, James IV, on 11 August 1501, empowered the earl ofHuntly to raise the sums that were due, 'and, gif nede be, to distrenze for the sammyn; and to rais our soverane lordis liegis apoun the personis that resistis him in the rasing thairof, without ony cryme to be imputt to him thairfor'.[195] Other areas distant from the centre were administered after a similar fashion, for the crown finance in the south west and the borders of Scotland was largely under the supervision of the Earls of Argyll and Bothwell and also lord Hume, who were donated powers not dissimilar to those given to the earl of Huntly in the north. Further south, the barony of Glenlion was let entirely to Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy, between 1495 and 1502 the lordship of Apnaduff was leased to Nigel Stewart [196] while the mains of Dunbar were let to sir Andrew Wood of Largo in 1501 for 9 years for an annual farm of 30 chalders of wheat and 30 chalders of bere and in 1507 the mains were leased to Andrew, bishop of Moray for 19 yeasrs for a cash rent of 550 marks. On 26 August 1510, however, the bishop, doubtless in order to spread the financial burden, brought his brother, sir John Forman of Rutherford, into the contract, which was now only granted for 9 years.[197] Although there can be little doubt that such concessions brought the lessee considerable profit and served to augment his position in the locality, nevertheless, such investments also required considerable capital and for this reason, they tended to be confined to the wealthier eschelons of society.

In 1480 the lands of Tullibeltan in Kinclevin were leased to 5 tenants, to Duncan, Donald and Maurice Henryson, John Gilchrist, and Andrew Young,

---

195. RSS, i, 723.

196. ER, x, 796, 762.

197. RSS, i, 872, 1529, 2120.

for the rental of £8-13-4, but by 17 July 1490, the entire lease was granted to Sir James Crichton of Ragorton only, for the same rate.[198] Letters of lease, recorded in the Registers of the Privy and Great Seals, which appear to have little bearing on the actual leasing of a particular portion of royal property may reflect the element of competition for these large leases or may have been employed to cajole the lessee into accepting the terms offered by the crown. Not only did this afford greater efficiency in collection of rent, it also gave the crown an excuse to raise its rent. When the lands of the lordship of Brechin and Nevar were administered by a chamberlain in the early 1480s, he was charged with a gross annual receipt of £148-1-10, 6 barels of salmon, 500 dried fish, 14 bolls of oats and other small kind items from the various tenants, but when the entire property was leased to William Hay, master of Errol in 1503, the rental had been elevated to 400 marks annually.[199] The history of the accounts of these lands for the periods 1476-82 and 1503-10 revealed that in the latter period, when the entire lands were under one lease, not only did the real revenue rise dramatically (namely the revenue paid by the chamberlain of lessee to the comptroller) but also the percentage of uncollected arrears descended to almost nil.[200] Although the rent increases which accompanied many of these extensive leases, especially when the length of tenure was granted beyond the normal 3 years, were usually accepted by the lessee, it

---

198. ER, ix, 574. : x, 695.

199. ER, ix, 56, 132, 173. : xii, 241. : RSS, i, 1612.

200. ER, viii, ix, xii, xiii.

	1476-82	1503-10
Average real revenue paid from the lands to the comptroller.	£ 51-4/-	£259-6/-
% age of lost revenue: i.e. the charge in the Rolls minus the real revenue, stated above.	Circa 66%	Circa 1%
Arrears at the end of each period	£515-9-1	Nil

was not uncommon for the original assessment to be reduced. On 1 September £30 worth of land within the lordship of Apnadull was leased to Robert Menzies for 5 years at an annual rent of £60 but when the lease was renewed on 6 June 1508, with no reduction in the length of tenure, the rent was cut to 70 marks.[201] This trend was reflected in other areas, where the comptroller treated directly with the lessee. The burden of collection had shifted from the crown to the private individual or lessee, for the chamberlain was no longer responsible for the rents collected from the various tenants, in the process often amassing large quantities of irretrievable arrears, instead the lessee paid a fixed rent to the comptroller, and it was left to the former to replenish himself from the tenants. The annual rent from royal property came to the crown by way of a hierarchy of tenants, the pyramid being relatively small in the more fertile regions but fairly large in areas in which it was difficult to extract a reasonable return. In the latter, those involved in royal estates must have spanned most ranks of lay society ranging from the cottars actually engaged in working the land to the substantial laird or magnate who dealt directly with the comptroller. Each additional layer on the pyramid must have increased the financial burden on those below him in the scale since a margin of profit would have been demanded at every stage. This arrangement had so many advantages for the crown, that is was employed in many portions of royal property by 1513.

It was in the crown's interest that there should not be any serious subdivision of holdings, which have drastically increased the number of tenants from which the crown had to collect rent. On the 28 August 1510, when the lands of Redhead in the ward of Tweed were feued, arrangements were made for the succession to the holding on the death of the quoted tenants and it was stated that this should be achieved without the division of the lands.[202] Although the above was a feu holding, the crown's policy towards

---

201. RSS, i, 866, 1688.

202. ER, xiii, 655.

leases was probably the same. Inevitably the number of tenants apportioned to a piece of land fluctuated over short periods, but there does not seem to have been any consistant increase during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. For instance, in 1480 fourteen tenants shared the lease of the king's barns in the earldom of Fife and by 1508 the number had risen to only sixteen while the number of royal tenants sharing the lands of the Newtown of Falkland remained at thirteen between these two dates.[203] Short term increases were the result of the acceptance into a share of the lease of the tenant's wife or son, but there was no permanent subdivision of responsibility for the payment of rent to the crown. Husbandmen and other small landowners only retained sufficient land in leasehold to provide for their eldest son. It was common for the heir of a tenant to be included in part of the lease during the lifetime of his father and on the latter's death the son merely took over the remaining portion of the holding. In 1480 the lease of the lands of Fernes and Dasky within the earldom of Strathearn was divided between John Philipson and William Mason, both of whom brought their eldest sons into a share of the contract. The division was more specific in the case of the lease of the lands of Wester Aberlednach for William Mason, senior, retained 8 marks of the holding and his son William was given the lease of 4 marks.[204] However, younger sons, although seldom included as direct tenants of the crown, would probably have assumed the role of subtenants to their father or elder brother. At the other end of the scale, the younger sons and scions of magnatial houses were able to invest in royal leases of their own accord. A substantial proportion of the property within the earldom of Strathearn, especially after 1488, was let to the scions of the house of Drummond.[205] In the 1503 rental of the

---

203. ER, ix, 589, 590, xiii, 612, 613.
204. ER, ix, 570-2
205. ER, x, 639-644, 690-5.

lordship of Galloway, there are recorded leases being held by Thomas, John and William McLellan, the sons of the laird of Bomby.[206] However, in the rental of the lordship of Orkney, prepared in 1502-4, the lessee, Henry lord Sinclair, appears to have relied heavily on his kinsmen for the subletting of his lease, then contributing to a family monopoly in that area.[207]

With certain exceptions, the majority of crown tenants tended to be locally based. In the rental of the earldom of Strathearn, the majority of the leases were held by the families of Drummond or Murray, while that of Ettrick Forest contained many local names like Ker of Cessford, Scott of Buccleuch and of Branxholme, Murray of Faulohill, Cranstone of Cranstone-riddale, the Hepburns and the Humes.

In 1469, an act of Parliament stated that the peace of the holy days was being greatly disturbed through the 'punding for malis and annualis incasting and owt casting of tennandis quhilkis makkis gret discensioune and cause oft tymmes gret gadderings and discordis upone the solempnit days of witsonday and martymes', and for the remedy, Parliament suggested that such activities be deferred until three days after these holy days.[208] Apart from the regular payment of rent and other dues, the overturn of tenants in crown leases, must have contributed considerably to the discord which occurred on these occasions.

---

206. ER, xii, 651-4.

207. Saint-clair, The Saint Clairs of the Isles, 130 : Peterkin, Rentals of the Ancient Earldom and Bishopric of Orkney. No.1, 1-101.
Under the rental of Henry Lord Sinclair, many of his kin held leases in Orkney. Sir William Sinclair held nearly all Sanday and Westray.
Sir John Sinclair held lands in north and south Sandvik.
Gilbert and Richard Sinclair held lands in South Ronaldsay.
Magnus Sinclair held the Bu of Karstane in Stromness.
Alexander Sinclair had Stravagar in Innerstromness, while David Sinclair and his son William held the lands of Mydhouse and others in the same district. James Sinclair held lands in Utterstromness.

208. A.P.S. ii, 95.

It was normal procedure for the commissioners, acting under the terms of reference of their appointment, to allow the sitting tenants the first choice of a particular lease for a further term after their existing contract had expired. This was a further reflection of the conservative approach adopted in settling Mediaeval leases. In May 1507, Andrew, Bishop of Caithness was required, when leasing the lands of Ross and The Black Isle, to lease the individual leases 'to the tenentis that browkit the sammyn of before, or to ony utheris sufficient tenentis for the space of five zeris, efter the ische of the takkis that the tennentis has of the sammyn'.[209] However, all things being equal, the sitting tenant was allowed preference at the renewal of his lease, but his retention of the lease was not to be tolerated if it was proved to be financially detrimental to the crown. At the renewal of a lease, the prime consideration was 'the king's profit', to thich all else was secondary.[210] In 1449, it was ordained by Parliament, that for the 'sauftie and favour of the pure pepil that labouris the grunde that thai and all utheris, that has takyn or sal tak landis in tyme to come fra lordis and has termes and yeris thereof, that, suppose the lordis sell or analy thai landis that the tackaris sall remayne with thare tackis unto the ische of thare termes'.[211] This was an attempt by the crown to ensure that the terms by which the lease was held were strictly adhered to, despite the change of superior. In the same way, in the crown rentals, the existing contract was allowed to expire before a new tenant could enter the lease, for instance, the portion of the King's Barns in the earldom of Fife which had been leased to William and Thomas Cawert, was, on 6 May 1491, leased to William Oliphant, for the term of three years, 'post exitum terminorum dictorum tenancium'.[212]

---

209. RSS, i, 1472.

210. RSS, i, 1810.

211. APS, ii, 35.

212. ER, x, 683.

However, if the existing tenant gave his consent, the new tenant could take over the holding for the years that remained of the original lease. On the 12 May 1491, the lands of Little Sauchie were let to David Douglas and his wife Margaret, through the consent of lord Bothwell 'pro terminis in ultima assedacione contentis'.[213]

The crown did demand a certain standard of conduct from its tenants. In 1499, a statute was issued to the tenants of Petty and Brackley, that the 'be kepit in tyme to cum in gude reule and peaz and justice without stoutht reff, reset of thift or of rebellis and theffis, sornyng, or uthir opressioun, and gif ony tenentis of the said landis takkis remissioun or respitt for thift, ref, sorning, resett, oppressioun, or ony punct therof tilbe commit fra thine furtht or beis therwith, uthirwais than being previt or knawing, thair takkis sall tharthrow, and it salbe leifull till our soverane lord till sett and dispone the sammyn till uthir tenentis.[214] The king also demanded the payment of all dues attached to a portion of land, and failure to do so might result in the loss of the tenant's lease. In a memorandum to the tenants of the earldom of Strathearn in October 1492, they were ordered to submit the grassums of all the lands quoted above in the rental by the next feast of St.Martin without further delay and failure to comply with these arrangements was to result in the loss of the tenant's lease with no possibility of remission.[215] In the same year, John Murray of Trowan, lessee of the lands of Drumquharane in the earldom of Strathearn was pledged to pay the chamberlain all the outstanding farms and grassums proved before the Steward's court while more specifically the same person was bound to submit a total of £18 rent and grassum arrears for £4 of the lands of Kepe of Drumfin, to the chamberlain within 24 days under pain of losing his lease.[216] On the 26 April 1510, the commissioners warned the

---

213. ER, x, 683.
214. ER, xi, 444.
215. ER, x, 730.
216. ER, x, 726, 728.

tenants and foresters of Ettrick Forest 'that has tane thair stedingis that thai cum and raise thair signatouris and pay thair grassoumez within xx days nixttocum, with certificatioun, and thai do nocht the lordis will sett theim till utheris'.[217] Similar fulminations were frequently included in the instructions to the commissioners letting crown land, but the effect must have been tempered by the demand for the lease of a particular area.

The shortness of the lease and the resultant lack of tenurial security were not, in theory, conducive to the long retention of a particular lease in one family. Concerning the majority of leases, beyond the entry recorded in the king's rental books, there was no proof as to a particular tenant's right of tenure. The tenant himself seems to have retained no proof of his right to his holding. Most Scottish tenants of the fifteenth century had not managed to achieve the security of tenure gained by the English copyholder, whose tenure was 'at the will of the lord according to the custom', and whose position was assured by the retention of a copy of the details of the holding. In February 1509-10 half the parkland of Doune was let for 9 years to Walter Badenock and Archibald Edmondstone 'under the conditions of 'le copihald'.[218] This is an isolated reference and probably refers to the conditions and services laid down for the previous lease since it was normal preactice to repeat the details of former rental books. The possibility of dismissal even within the duration of a contract was always a possibility and indeed there is evidence of such occurrances. On 1 December 1490 a sixteenth part of the lands of Luthrie, which William Cameron held by the terms of the last lease of the earldom of Fife, were now let to George Kinloch for the terms quoted in the last lease through Cameron's dismissal from the holding.[219] There was a

---

217. ER, xiii, 649.

218. ER, xiii, 634-5. While most of the royal porperty within the earldom of Menteith was being feued, the parkland of Doune proved an exception, being leased for a period of 9 years.

219. ER, x, 682.

considerable overturn of tenants within the period of various lease contracts. The large amount of entries to crown leases arranged usually at the annual Exchequer, revealed the extent of this overturn.[220] Some alterations in tenancy reflected the presence of royal pressure. On 20 March 1487-8, John Terras, the sitting tenant in an eighth part of the lands of Kettle in Fife, was replaced by John Thompson within the duration of his contract and it was stated that Terras left the lease at his own free will and, much more telling, at the request of the king.[221]

A variety of reasons were recorded for a lease changing hands outwith the family of the former tenant. The most common reason for the transfer of a lease was stated in the rentals to be 'nunce de expresso consiensu et benevolencia', which implied at least on the surface, a voluntary surrender of the lease by the tenant involved.[222] No reasons for the surrender are ever given in the rental, but it is probably that economics may have played a prominant part. Although lack of funds forced many royal tenants to surrender their rights to certain leases, it is likely that the crown took advantage of the insecurity of most leaseholdings to substitute one tenant for another. The motivation behind the desire to preserve this persistant overturn of tenants was financial as each fresh entry was accompanied by a fine. On 24 September 1489 Robert Bruce took over the holding of 1½ bovates of the Halls of Airth from Hugh Henryson, through the latter's consent, and submitted an entry fine of 30/-, the equivalent of a single year's rent.[223] Thus, with the charge in tenancy within the period of the previous lease, the crown was able to extract an extra year's rent from the lands concerned. Although this could be seen as a form of rackrenting, its prevalence must

---

220. ER, x, 659-663, 680-4.

221. ER, ix, 638.

222. ER, ix, 637.

223. ER, x, 660.

not be overstressed since it was dependant on the availability of potential tenants to create a suitable demand for the lease. It would seem that, in many cases, the 'consent' and 'benevolence' of the tenant to his removal from a holding, as frequently recorded in the rental books, was little more than a formal expression which hid more complex motivations.[223] However, in addition to the rental books, several lessees, especially those who were in receipt of fairly extensive leases and also those granted for periods longer than the usual 3 or 5 years, sought further confirmation of their contracts by means of a royal letter issued under the privy seal. This must have provided the lessee with greater security of tenure although there is evidence of such leases failing to run their full course. On 3 July 1496 £40 of land within the lordship of Strathbran was leased to John Lindsay, master of Crawford for the term of 5 years, but on the following 21 January the entire lordship, along with the lands of Apnadull and Glencioch, was let for 5 years to Nigel Stewart of Fortingall. Even this lease lasted only 2½ years for on 1 May 1499 the entire lordship of Strathbran was feued to sir Patrick Hume of Polworth and sir Robert Lundy of Balgowny.[224] The death of a tenant without heirs obviously resulted in a change of the family holding the lease. The non payment of rent and other dues and conviction for criminal offences were other notable causes of removal. Concerning the latter, in 1504, the lease of the lands of Culmore in the lordship of Strathdearn was declared vacant since the previous tenant, Hugh Forbes, was convicted of rebellion.[225] After the lease of the lands of the Earldom of Strathearn in 1490, it was stated that the leases which William, David, Maurice and Walter Drummond and William Robinson had held were now leased to John, lord Drummond with the

---

224. ER, x, 762.

225. ER, xii, 667.

with the additional memorandum that he was not to support them or any others at the king's horm.[226] This action formed the aftermath of the burning of several members of the Murray family by relatives of lord Drummond in the church of Monzievaird - an extention of the long standing Murray-Drummond feud, of which more will be said later.[227] By a bond agreed by sir William Murray of Tullibardine and lord Drummond, the latter promised to make reparation for all the wrongs done by his clan and the loss of the leases above was obviously part of the attempt at reconciliation demanded by the government.[228] Various other occurrances occasioned the loss of the lease, for, the brother of Donald Makkaw lost his lease through being out of the country,[229] while the lands of Kershope in the ward of Ettrick were let to Thomas Murray, who replaced his mother Elizabeth in the lease because she had married without the king's consent.[230] However, family continuity in crown leases varied considerably from one area to another. In the Tweed ward of Ettrick forest, out of the 16 individual lessees in that area, 10 recorded the same surname between 1484 and 1510. Although these figures reveal a fair degree of family continuity in the

in the leases of that area, the case is slightly misleading, for

---

226. ER, x, 694. Lairds involved in 1490 lease of Strathearn

David Drummond Probably the third son of John L. Drummond, executed At Stirling, October 1490 (Paul, Scots Peerage, vii, 44 TA i, 170) The Broadland of Balloch, Cargartland, Whiteballoch, East and West Lochlane, Trowan and Dry Island.

Maurice Drummond - Drumquharacan

William Drummond - Fordon, half of East Aberlennoch and Laggan Glentarken, half of Port Island Balmuir, Leitterbannochty, Ross (yet these lands remained in his hands)

Walter Drummond - Easterdalginross.

227. ER, x, L - Ll. Lindsay of Pitscottie, History of Scotland, i, 237.

228. ADC, (1468-95), 167.

TA, i, 178. Both leaders summoned to ward 17 June 1491.

229. ER, ix, 637.

230. ER, ix, 636.

out of those 10 leases mentioned above, it was found that although two of the families concerned were in possession of their respective leases in both 1484 and 1510, they had temporarily lost the tenancy in the interim. The lease of the lands of Gaithope, for instance, revealed that the family of Tait retained the lease until 1499, when it was divided between John Murray, David Pringle and Margaret Liddale, then in 1501 it passed to Alexander, lord Hume, and only when the lands were feued in 1510 did they return to the Taits. However, other areas demonstrated a greater degree of family overturn, for, out of the 18 leases of the barony of Skeoch, 8 were still occupied by the same family, while only 5 out of 25 leases of Galloway 'above the Cree' were retained by members of the same family.[231]

Although, in theory, the king's lease was not a hereditary tenure, frequently the lease was handed down from father to son as if it were.[232] On the death of a tenant it was common for the lease to be relet to either his widow alone, or to her in association with the son of the deceased tenant.[233] If the tenant's son was of age, he was often included in his father's lease while the latter was still alive, On payment of the usual entry fine, such successions within the family were easily accomplished. It was common for a tenant to include his wife in his lease, as Patrick Erskine did in his 19 year lease of Thomastone in Fife in 1485.[234] Changes in the family holding a lease was often the result of a widow remarrying and associating her new husband in her lease. In 1508, the tenant of the lands of Auld Lundoris in the earldom of Fife, Walter Lesley, the king's Marischal, was declared dead, the new lease was made out to his widow, Elizabeth Ballone, and her husband Alexander Kincragy and when the lands were set in feu, Alexander was recorded as being the sole tenant.[235]

---

231. See Appendix No.B/3(a)-(e)

232. See Cultranny in Strathearn, Fastheuch and Craghope in Ettrick and Mill of Done in Fife.

233. ER, ix, 647. The Garden and Brewhouse of Dunmure. ; ER ix, 628, the lands of Glenlichern.

234. ER, ix, 647.

235. ER. xiii. 615. 618.

Refusal to accept the terms of a particular lease was another occasion for the change in tenants. The terms of the lease presented a continual bone of contention between the crown and the prospective tenant, both sides attempting to extract the best terms available. If a tenant refused to accept the terms offered, the king was forced to find another tenant who would accept the terms. The relatively slack demand for land during the major part of the fifteenth century, the result of a dramatic fall in the population level from the early part of the fourteenth century, shifted the economic bias temporarily from the landlord to the tenant. The availability of real estate meant the prospective tenant were able to 'shop around' for the best terms, often refusing leases if the conditions were not sufficiently attractive. In order to induce tenants to accept lease contracts, the crown, in common with other landlords, was often compelled to reduce the financial commitments. On 25 July 1481 the lands of Fothray, Balnakettle and the Mill of Luthrie were leased to various tenants but, in a memorandum inserted at the foot of the rental, it was recorded that the tenants had refused the leases, being unwilling to pay the grassums demanded, and that the property had subsequently been relet to John Strathachin of Thornton and his son, but unfortunately there is no indication as to whether other terms had been offered to the new tenants.[236] The laird of Cranstone refused the lease of the lands of the Midstead of Langhope in 1486, with the result the lands were let to the comptroller, George Robinson, without a grassum being levied.[237] However, William Scott refused the lease of the lands of Deiphope in Ettrick, but the rentals recorded that he afterwards accepted the lease with the grassum being remitted by the commissioners on account of waste and, in this case, the king was probably unable to attract another tenant at the terms he desired.[238] At the lease of Kettle, in the

---

236. ER, ix, 581.

237. ER, ix, 615.

238. ER, ix, 616.

earldom of Fife, in 1481, the tenants refused the lease when required to raise a grassum of £10, and only accepted the lease when the grassum was reduced to 5 marks.[239] Refusal to accept the lease of the lands of Ardate, in Fife, on the first day of the lease in 1495, incurred the tenants a fine of £2-10/- to offset the expenses of the commissioners.[240] The political climate also affected the distribution of leases of crown land. The rental of the earldom of Strathearn provided the most notable example of this, for the rivalry in this area of the Murrays and the Drummonds, was reflected in the leasing of royal property within the earldom which was given greater moment in the crisis of 1488, when the families inevitable found themselves in opposite camps. Between 1488 and 1492, the Murray complex of leases within the earldom was almost totally granted to the supporters of Prince James, namely the Drummonds, the Oliphants and James Redheuch, and, although the former family regained much of what it lost by 1492, some lands were permanently alienated. It would appear, that the new government, no doubt influenced by Lord Drummond, was induced to punish the Murrays by depriving them of their leases in Strathearn for a period of three or four years, but the need to reconcile the supporters of James III demanded the return of the majority of them.[241]

A large number of families in Scotland found investment in crown leases an attractive proposition. The lease represented an investment, from which, for an initial outlay of capital, the tenant would expect to derive a considerable return. On average, the larger the lease, and therefore, the larger the capital sum required for the investment, the more powerful and influential the tenant. As mentioned already large leases in the north were accepted by such men as the earls of Huntly and Errol, who already retained large personal holdings in the area, or lesser man like Innes of that ilk,

---

239. ER, ix, 590.

240. ER, x, 746.

241. See Appendix No.B/3(b)

Grant of Freuchie and Forbes of Tollis, who employed their resources in royal leases. The capital required for investment in crown leases varied not only according to the actual size of the lease involved, but also according to the length of the lease and the competition for it. Although longer leases, with their greater security of tenure, often resulted in the doubling of the rent during the reign of James IV. The grassum demanded was usually small, for, William, earl of Errol received the lease of the lordship of Brechin and Navar for 11 years at the rent of 400 marks, while only paying a grassum of 100 marks.[242] In 1488 the lands of Drumcoll were let to Alexander Boyd and Robert Murehead, at the ratio of 4 to 1, for an annual rent of 100 marks but the grassum was waived as the rent had recently been augmented although in subsequent renewals of the lease a grassum of £40 was demanded.[243] The leasing of an entire lordship to a single person demanded the possession of considerable capital. At the outset the lessee was in theory required to pay a year's rent as a grassum and also submit a fee for the issuing of the letter of lease under the privy seal. In 1504 Alexander Gordon of Midmar submitted a composition of 500 marks to the treasurer for his 'letter of tack' of the lands of Strathdee and Cromar.[244] In the earldom of Fife, where competition for the lease was more keen, the prospective tenant might be required to invest considerable capital. For a three years lease of the lands of the Hall of Rossy in 1502, the tenant John Bonar, the heir of James Bonar, was to submit the annual rent of £5-6-8 and 23 capons, yet he was also required to pay a grassum of £13-6-8, and an entry fine for himself and his wife of £20.[245]

---

242. ER, xiii, 643. See also the 9 year lease of the lands of Galloway in May 1503 where the land leased amounted to £721-18-8 in the rental, yet the grassum total amounted to only £185-12/- and that mostly comprised of lands whose rent had not been augmented, and from which a grassum was therefore collected.

243. ER, x, 637, xi, 450, 644.

244. RSS, i, 1026. TA, ii, 190.

245. ER, xii, 618. For the three years of that particular lease, the tenant paid a total of £49-6-8 and 69 capons for the lease of that portion of land.

However, men of all rnnks of society were willing to invest their fortunes in building up blocks of crown leases. Out of the total lease of crown property within the lordship of Galloway 'below the Cree' in 1490, yielding an annual rent of £358-10/-, Patrick earl of Bothwell retained the lease of £223-10/- worth of land, but by 1503, local families had regained all their leases and the earl's name does not appear at all in later rentals.[246] However, despite the lack of the rentals for the earldom of March, it would appear that the majority of estates were leased to the Humes in a more settled fashion. In an isolated lease of Rig and Fluris it was recorded that the lands were leased to Alexander Hume of Spot with the assent of Alexander, Lord Hume, who asserted that he had the lease of the entire lordship of March.[247] Within many of the earldoms and lordships, several families, of a class immediately below the nobility, wer quietly building up fairly large holdings of crwon leases. Many of the heads of these families were given the designation of Laird. The rental of the earldom of Menteith revealed the rise of the family of Edmonstone of Duntreath, for, apart from the lands attached to the Castle of Doune, which Edmonstone held as keeper, their share of crown leases in that region more than doubled during the period 1480 and 1502. The rental of the lands of the lordship of Galloway in 1503 revealed how many of these lairdly families, namely McLellan of Bomby, Maxwell of Tynwald, Carnis of Orchardtown, Lindsay of Fairgirth, Murray of Cockpoo, Dunbar of Mochrum, McCulloch of Myreton, and McDowall of Gartlane, occupied several royal leases in that area.[248] Similarly the Humes held many leases within Ettrick forest, between 1488 and 1490 various members of the Hume family complex were let royal property at

---

246. ER, x, 701-4. : xii, 650-4.

247. ER, x, 761. : RSS, i, 241, 403, 422, 1887. Hist. M.SS Commission 12th Report, Appendix Part 8, No.13

248. See Appendix. No.B/3(a),(c)

an annual rent of £101-3-4, representing almost 17 steads, in 1499 the rent paid by the Humes had fallen to only £76-10/-. However, with the introduction of the 9 year lease as the norm within the forest, the Humes seem to have invested in royal leases within the forest to a substantial extent, paying an annual rent of £1,154-17-8 (the gross rent for the entire area now amounted to £2670-3-4) but when the estate was feued in 1510 the share retained by the Humes fell to an annual farm of £333-13-4.[249] With the augmentation in the rent level following the employment of the 9 year lease, it seems likely that many of the original tenants were unwilling or unable to meet the increased financial demands and the wealthy family of Hume stepped in although the attractions of the feu farm system of land-holding encouraged many to return to their former holdings. Smaller tenants with their limited capital resources, tended to hold leases of small proportions and often shared a lease with numerous other tenants. With the rise in the grassum level in many regions in the later fifteenth century and the augment-ation of rents in several areas in the early sixteenth century, many of these smaller tenants fell into the ranks of the subtenant when the king let property to men of more substance who were willing to pay the increased levy. In 1481-2 three tenants shared half the lease of the lands of Murcohcairnie, paying a grassum of £8, stated to be at that rate because of their poverty, but by 1490 the entire lease had been let to Thomas Inglis at a grassum of £10.[250] Yet this movement away from the smaller tenants was delayed considerably by their combining together to meet the raised demands of the King.

The number and arrangement of tenants within a particular portion of royal property seem to have alternated according to various circumstances, but principally the effect of the death of a sitting tenant and the financial

---

249. ER, x, 650-4, 675, 680. xi, 396-402, 457-460, xiii, 649-654.

250. ER, ix, 587. : x, 670.

viability of individual tenants. Concerning the lands of Fernes and Dasky within the earldom of Strathearn, from 1480 until 1488 the lands were let to John Philipson and William Mason in equal portions, each submitting an annual rent of £3. However, in 1488, John lord Drummond took over Mason's share of the lease, with the latter assuming the role of a sub-tenant, but by 1492 the position had altered again, for James Redheuch accepted the lease of the lands of Dasky, paying an annual farm of £2, while the lease of the lands of Fernes, at a farm of £4, was now divided between Philipson and Mason. On 10 July 1498, following the death of John Philipson his son was able to retain only half of the Philipson portion, the other half being temporarily let to Walter Drummond until May 1499 when Philipson's widow managed to regain that portion of the holding. By this time however, William Mason had lost his half of the lease of Fernes to Patrick Hume of Polworth. When the lands were feued in 1510, Philipson retained his right to half the lands of Fernes while Patrick Hume of Polworth had been replaced in his portion by Patrick Scott.[251] The lease of these lands during the reigns of James III and IV revealed that the lease was subdivided to suit the situation at particular points of time. Also, of the original tenants, both of fairly limited resources, Mason was superceeded first by lord Drummond in 1488 and secondly, and this time permanently, by sir Patrick Hume of Polworth, probably as Mason was unable to maintain the fiscal demands of the lease. Philipson on the other hand, remained an immediate tenant of the crown in the lands in question, his share of the lease falling from a half to a third but, on account of the lease being extended to 9 years in

---

251. See Appendix No.B/3(b)
In 1502 John Philipson was tenant in a portion of the lands of Balmuck, also in the earldom of Strathearn, paying an annual farm of $2\frac{1}{2}$ marks. Although a certain John Philipson was the tenant of the entire lease of Dundurn at an annual rent of £39-13-4 he was the son of Finlay Philipson and not the same person as the tenant of Fernes.
ER, xii, 628, 685-6.

1502 and then feued in 1510, he was paying an annual farm of £5 as distinct from £3 in 1480. The increased financial demands of investment in the development of royal property forced many royal tenants with limited resources into the ranks of sub-tenants or else reduced the size of their direct holdings. Thirdly, many of the new investors in royal leases tended to be or higher social status with greater supplies of capital, in this case James Redheuch, sir Patrick Hume of Polworth and Patrick Scott, of which the first two are frequent lessees of royal property and prominent royal servants. However, some tenants from humble origins were able to improve their position. During the period when land was relatively cheap and royal leases could be accumulated with a limited amount of capital, several families took advantage of the favourable situation. In 1480 Joan Bruce and her son John held in leasehold only 4 of the 32 bovates in the Halls of Airth. By 1490 the Bruce family had expanded their interest considerably for sir Alexander Bruce and his brother Edward held the lease of 8 bovates, also possessing the right to sublet, Robert Bruce, senior, was let 1½ bovates, Robert Bruce of Standhouse possessed the lease of a further 4 bovates, Edward Bruce held 1½ bovates in lease and an additional 4 bovates were claimed by Robert Bruce of Stanehouse in feufarm.[252] In the lease of the lands of Luthrie in the earldom of Fife, in 1481-2 there was no mention of George Kinloch, but by 1490 he held the lease of one eigth of the land, by 1505 he held nine thirty seconds, and in 1511 was in a position to bid for half the feu of the lands at the value of £40.[253] A similar rise in fortune can be seen in the lands of Newtown of Reras, also in Fife, where, in 1481-2, Joan Gourlay held a twelth part of the lease, but by the lease of 1499, her descendant, Patrick, was the lessee of half of the entire estate.[254]

---

252. ER, ix, 557, x, 665.

253. ER, ix, 587, : x, 670. : xiii, 610, 624.

254. ER, ix, 589. : xi, 426.

From a small selection of leases in the earldom of Fife of the tenants that were traceable from 1481-2 to 1508, it can be seen that most of the families retained a lease of almost constant size, and such subdivision as were evident were often of a temporary nature.[255]

In several earldoms and lordships, the accumulation of royal leases was evident during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. On the borders this phase was given a boost by the success of the rebel party in 1488. With the triumph of the Humes and Hepburns at the battle of Sauchieburn, and their subsequent rise in position and wealth, a large number of the crown's leases on the border came under their domination, both permanently and temporarily.

The granting of a lease to a tenant did not automatically ensure his immediate and peaceful occupancy of the lands in question, nor did it guarantee that the tenant would enjoy his lease for the period stated undisturbed. The 'Acta Dominorum Concilii' and the 'Acta Dominorum Audtiorum' are full of cases of the illegal occupation of leases, the spoiling of leased lands and the withholding of farms due to tenants. For these reasons, it was essential that a tenant could produce, on demand, the evidence of his occupancy, namely the lease granted under the privy seal of by the commissioners. Although the court books contained numerous cases of disputed leases and the illegal occupation of leases, the cost and the inconvenience of bringing a case to court must have discouraged many from seeking such a remedy. By consulting the past records of the Exchequer Rolls and the king's rentals, many disputes were resolved. On the 12 June 1493, when David Balfour, Alexander Stirling and David Hunter were seen to have acted illegally in ejecting Nicholas, Robert and William Banks from the lease of the lands of the Banks of Row, which the latter were to continue to enjoy, as proved by an inspection of a copy of the rental extract written in the hand of Edward Spittale.[256]

---

255. See Appendix No.B/3(d)

256. ADA, 175.

The disputed occupancy of a crown lease was one of the most common entries in the judicial records of the kings council. To decide the rights of each case, the lords of the council demanded proof as to the right of occupation, either in the form of the lease itself, or by consultation with the Exchequer Rolls or the crown rentals. On the 10 October 1478, the Lords of the Council sent a letter to the sheriff of Fife, charging him to 'devoide and red' John Gourlaw, Walter Smith and 6 other men, 'furth of the landis of Auld Lindoris gevin and assignit be our soverain lord to John of Ballone as is contenit in his lettres and that he kepe the said John undistrublit in the joysing of the said landis ay and quhill the said personis bring and schew before the lordis sufficiand lettres of tak of mare strenth than the said John of Ballone has now schewin'.[257] The fact that the letter of lease of the lands of Auld Lindoris to John Ballone appeared in the Exchequer Rolls themselves and that he continued in occupation of the lease in question, suggested that his case was legitimate.[258] Inability to produce evidence of a lease, or the failure to appear on the appointed day, normally decided the case in favour of the other party if the latter could produce sufficient proof. However, the question became more complex on the occasion of both parties producing evidence to support their claims. On the 11 March 1478-9, both George Steward and William Edmonstone produced letters of lease, granted by the king, for the forest of Glenfinglas, but since William's letter was dated before that of George, the former was decreed to be in legal possession of the lease for the remaining terms of his lease.[259]

The lease of the fishing of the Spey, and other lands within the earldom of Moray, demonstrated the manner in which the crown played off two

---

257. ADC, i, 7.

258. ER, ix, 101, 648.

259. ADA, 71.

prospective tenants against one another with the purpose of gaining a higher rental, and the judicial action required to frustrate the continual interference of one of the competitors. The fishing had been leased to Alexander Innes of the ilk for 2½ lasts of salmon on 13 December 1495, but, in order to raise the rent , it was leased to the burgh of Elgin for 4 lasts on 9 April 1501, but later reduced to 3½ lasts on the 2 May.[260] In October of that year, Alexander Innes alleged ownership of the lease of the fishing and certain lands in Moray, but he failed to assert his case, as the leases granted by the comptroller under the royal commission to the burgh of Elgin and others were of a date prior to any lease granted to Alexander.[261] By depriving Alexander of the lease for a short period, the king forced him to accept the lease at the elevated rate of 3½ lasts of salmon.[262] However on the 23 June 1503, the baillies of the burgh of Elgin were forced to complain that Alexander Innes, who was due to enter the lease at the Feast of St.Andrews, had intromitted with the fishing before that date and he was ordered to desist and restore any of the profits which he had illegally accepted.[263] There are several references in the judicial records to tenants interfering with leases either just before they were due to enter or just after the had relinquished it. It would seem from this case, and there were many in similar vein, that there was a certain degree of inefficiency in the issuing of letters of lease from the privy seal and such confrontations were bound to occur when more than one letter of lease was granted for the same portion of land. An extract from the king's

---

260. ER, x, 525, 766. : xi, 434. : RSS, i , 682.

261. ER, xi, 435-6. ADC, ii, 380. Here Alexander Innes alleged possession of the lease of the fishing of the Spey at 30 barrels of Salmon annually, but the comptroller stated that it was leased at 3 lasts annually, although under the terms of the lease to the Burgh of Elgin, in operation at that time, the rent was assessed at 3½ lasts annually. RSS, i, 682.

262. ER, xii, 669, 225-6. : RSS, i, 921.

263. ADC, xiv, f 171.

was normally sufficient proof of the tenant's right to a portion of land, but, in competition with a letter of lease issued under the privy seal, the latter took precedence. On the 5 December 1494, in a dispute between Archibald Boyd of Nairston and William Campbell over the lease of the lands of Ballinshaw and Dryrig, within the lordship of Stewarton, James IV wrote to the lords of the Session informing them that the latter's claim to a tack under the privy seal was not viable, 'for he has na lettrez of owris bot be set of our comptrollour for the tume and haid na forther power of ws bot to set efter the forme of our commissioun', with the result Archibald's letters, issued under the privy seal, were declared of greater force.[264] Although seemingly cut and dry, this case was not terminated at that point for, in 1493, William Campbell is recorded as pursuing an action against Archibald Boyd for the illegal occupation of these lands, since the former claimed they now belonged to him in liferent by the king's gift and by lease of the king's comptroller and over a year later William claimed that he had sustained loss through not possessing the lease for the 3 years following 1494. On 20 February 1499-1500, William's losses were listed in detail. On that date, the Lords of the Council decreed that the defender ought not to occupy the lease which belonged to William Campbell by lease from the king, his commissioners and the comptroller under the privy seal, and ordered them to pay a specific amount after consulting the rentals.[265] In fact, this controversy revealed some interesting facts, firstly that similar confusion over the holding of royal leases was largely occasioned by the vicissitudes of royal patronage and the lack of contact between the various departments of the royal administration. Although Campbell gained a complete reversal of the 1494 decision in February 1499-1500, nevertheless, on 27 December 1498 a fresh letter of tack, issued under the privy seal, was granted

---

264. ADA, 197.

265. ADC, ii, 278, 352, 405.

to Archibald Boyd and his wife, Christine Mure, concerning the royal property under consideration to endure for 'al the dais of their life'.[266] However, Campbell's position as the king's macer and the fact that his fee was paid from the farms of the lands of Ballinshaw and Dryrig must have favoured his case.[267] However, on 9 September 1502, the lease was transferred finally to Archibald Boyd at double the farm.[268] As control over the granting of leases seems to have been rather haphazard, it is little wonder that attempts were made to defraud either the king or the sitting tenants. On the 12 October 1478, William Cunningburgh was found guilty of attempting to deceive the crown and the royal commissioners over the lease of the lands of Stramanane in Bute, since he maintained that he had received the lease through the consent and good will of Finlay McAlan, the former tenant, but such consent had not been granted by Finlay and it was decided to remove William fron the lease.[269] It may be that several lessees or prospective lessees either composed their own letters of lease or amended the original royal letter in an effort to extract more favourable terms and often leading to confrontation with the owner of the legal writ. On 15 February 1499-1500, in an action between Margaret Spittal, widow of Thomas Crawford of Bonnington, and Robert Barton over the lease of the assise herring of the east sea, Margaret produced her letter of tack under the king's privy seal and the lords of the Council assigned her 3 July next 'til produce the writare that wrat the sade leter, because it was allegyit be the sade Maister James (the king's advocate) that the last lyne contenit in the sammyn letter was part suspect and was nocht writtin the tyme that the remanent of the sade letter was writin, and til bring quhat persone that wil grant was sollicitar thairof at the Kingis hand'.[270]

---

266. RSS, i, 308.
267. ER, x, 110, 211, 266, 338, 415, 496, 700, 744, xi, 108.
268. ER, xii, 649.
269. ADC, i, 8.
270. ADC, ii, 397.

The sitting tenant was frequently unable to enjoy peaceful possession of his leases. In 1474, the Auditors decreed that the tenants of Uddingstone were to retain their leases in the manner in which they were let to them by the comptroller, and that Robert Paterson was warned against troubling them in their occupation of a third part of the lands.[271] Illegal occupation of a lease and the resultant withholding of the profits of the land, often involved a subtenant. On the 12 February 1489-90, in an action pursued by Robert Carlisle against Bernard Mure, his subtenant, over the latter's occupation of the lands of Culcagre in Galloway, the pursuer claimed restitution for the illegal detention of the profits of the lands for the last three years, which he had assessed at £20 annually, 'by good estimation'. Bernard Mure, as subtenant seems to have occupied the lands in question, without paying any rent or dues to his superior, a situation which frequently provoked legal action. As before, the pursuer attempted to gain the maximum damages from the case, for Robert claimed a loss of £20 annually for three years, but Bernard alleged that he had already paid the farms and duties for the first two years, while the farm paid by Robert to the king amounted only to £4 annually.[272] A similar attempt was evident in the action pursued by William Campbell. During the period of the dispute, the royal property of Ballinshaw and Dryrig provided the crown with an annual 'reddendo' of £3-6-8 but the losses claimed by Campbell on February 1499-1500 revealed the extent of profit derived from such property and also the willingness on the part of the pursuer to overestimate the sum due. Campbell's losses for each of the three years 'through want of his tak and maling' were calculated to amount to 32½ chalder of oats, 20 bolls of beer, 2 bolls of wheat, hay worth 5 marks, 'the proffit of ane bow of ky' worth 10 marks, the pasturing of eight horses at 4/- a horse, the pasturing of

---

271. ADA, 36.

272. ADA, 133. : ER, x, 219.

30 'yeld nolt' at £3 and fodder valued at £12-10/-, commuted to an annual cash value of £96-2/- but instead, he was awarded damages worth only £48-13-4 'as satisfaction for the whole three years'.[273]

Certain tenants were vigorous in the defence of their leases. In 1484, Thomas Walker successfully defended his right to the lease of a quarter of the Mill of Dron, with a house and 2 acres of land attached to it, from the illegal occupation of George Bassilly, Robert Mailvill, both elder and younger, and John Strang, who were commanded to repay the farms annexed and pay for those possessions of Thomas which they had spuilzied.[274] Also, along with the other tenants of the lands of Dron, Thomas Walker defended their leases against the illegal encroachment of John Bonar, an example of the efforts of a group of tenants to squash the dubious activities of a more powerful neighbour.[275] Numerous entries in the judicial records reflected the distrubed nature of crown leaseholding, with disputed ownership, interference with the sitting tenant, and the spuilzie of the goods belonging to the sitting tenants prominent. The exchequer records and the crown rentals gave little insight into the friction that surrounded many of the leases. As mentioned above, lack of cohesion between the various administrative departments of the king's government was a contributary factor to the confusion over the ownership of crown leases. The case of Archibald Boyd and William Campbell over the lease of the lands of Bollinshaw and Dryrig in Stewarton revealed the confusing effect of the issue of more than

---

273. ADC, ii, 405.

The amount claimed by William Campbell for each of the three years.	Amount that was ordered to be paid, for the entire three years.
22½ chalders of Oats at 4 marks a chalder	33 chalders, 12 bolls at similar price.
20 bolls of beer, at 8/- a boll.	30 bolls.
2 bolls of wheat, at 10/- a boll.	3 bolls.
Hay worth 5 marks	10 marks for Hay
'The profit of ane bow of ky', worth 10 marks.	£20
The pasturage of 8 horses at 4/- each.	£ 2-10/- total
The pasturage of 30 'holt' (black cattle) £3.	£ 6.
600 'thraiffis' of fodder at 5d each.	£ 4.

274. ADA, 139.

275. ADA, 139. : ER, ix, 645-6.

one lease for the same portion of property.[276] Also, in 1496 Robert Stewart issued a complaint against George, earl of Huntly and William Gordon, his son, over the lease of the lands of Abernethy 'pertenyng to the saidis persons be ressone of tak and assedacione set be the Kingis hienis his commissionaris, and because that baith the saidis partyis producit the tak and assedacione of the saidis landis', one issued under the privy seal and dated 21 December 1495 and the other letter of tack set by the commissioners on 3 February 1495-6. Following consideration of 'thare richtis, ressons and allegacions, togidder with the saidis letters of assedacions producit and schawin before the Lordis', the Lords Auditors decreed that William Gordon 'sall broik and jois the saidis landis of Abirnethy efter the tenor of his assedacione'.[277] Stewart's lease of 3 February 1495-6 was recorded in the King's rental books[278] but there is no similar record of the other letter but, assuming its existance, the earlier letter of tack would normally have taken precedence.

During the fifteenth century, the lands of the island of Bute were occupied by rentallers or kindly tenants, whose tenure bore certain resemblances to the English copyholder, whose holding was based on customary law. Although there were allusions to leasing the property of Bute, as early as 1440 when £3-10-1 was paid for the expenses of William Cranston, comptroller, for the leasing of the lands of Arran, Bute and Cowal.[279] Isolated references in the king's rentals and the Register of the Privy Seal suggested that at least some of the king's property in Bute was converted to leaseholding.[280] On 24 May 1406 a commission was appointed, including the

---

276. ADA, 197.

277. ADC, ii, 11-2.

278. ER, x, 762. The lands of Abernethy were leased to Robert Stewart of Clawalg on the death of his father for three years after the following Whitsun term, the lease being settled by Archibald, earl of Argyll, lord Drummond and sir Duncan Forrester, the comptroller, the king's commissioners.

279. ER, v, 85.

280. RSS, i, 63, 64, 713, 1317. ER, x, 684.

bishop of Argyll, the bishop of the Isles, Henry, abbot of Jedburgh, Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy, sir John Stirling of Craigbernard, the comptroller James Redheuch and sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch, to lease the royal property within the lordship of Bute to tenants for the period of 3 or 5 years,[281] but, on 16 August the same year, a charter was issued to the tenants and inhabitants of Bute who had been 'infeft of old in the lands by his predecessors in the manner of feufarm', which converted their holdings officially to the feu system and although a double entry fine was due on the entry of the heir to the infeftment, the old rent was retained.[282]

With the evolution of longer and larger leases in the course of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and their consequent demands on the capital resources of the tenant, the principal benefactors proved to be members of the lairdly class. The possessed sufficient resources to acquire blocks of small leases or a large single lease, and the trend to longer holdings provided them with greater security of tenure. Although some of the nobility, the earls of Argyll, Huntly, Errol and Bothwell and lord Hume, did acquire crown leases, the majority of their holdings were situated outside the sphere of crown influence. The greater part of the nobility of Scotland did not, in fact, invest in crown leaseholdings.

This development, involving the men of lairdly status, was further accelerated with the introduction of feuing. The basic benefits to the tenant were, firstly that it was a heritable tenure, and so avoiding the worst abuses of tenurial insecurity, about which Major expounded at great length, and secondly it liberated the tenant from the more onerous feudal casualties. The system of feuing involved the granting of a fief by a

---

281. RSS, i, 1263.

282. RMS, ii, 2987. The gross annual farm remained almost static from the mid fifteenth century until 1513, for, during that period it rose from £141-18-6 and a quantity of barley and marts to £142-3-3 and the same king of returns.

superior in which the tenant, instead of performing military service, paid for his holding in cash, and, in some cases, kind. The principal feature of the feu system was that it was intended to be a commercial arrangement designed to provide the superior with a steady and substantial flow of cash. The conversion of a holding from lease to feu tended to accelerate the commutation of many of the surviving services and duties which served to restrict the freedom of a substantial majority of tenants. In 1513 the chamberlain of Fife was allowed £8 for the expenses of cultivating and harvesting the hay from the meadow of Falkland for the previous two years since the feuars of Fife were no longer required to perform that task.[283] To the crown, the advantages were equally attractive, in the short term for feuing provided the excuse for raising the annual rent, and, at the outset of the feu, a large entry fine was levied and continued to be levied on each subsequent entry to the feu. These arrangements provided the bare bones of the system of feuing. Inevitably, variations were prolific, and the benefits which both sides anticipated were not always forthcoming.

Apart from the burghs,[284] feu farming first assumed prominence in the fourteenth century. At that time it was not the crown, but ecclesiastical landlords, who perpetuated this form of land tenure.[285] Their incentives were essentially twofold, firstly, unlike their lay counterparts, they were not so much concerned with military service, and secondly, heavy expenses in Rome and national taxation demanded the steady supply of cash.[286] In the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, there are very few examples of lay feuing.

---

283. ER, xiii, 506.

284. See chapter on the burghs.

285. Liber de Calchou, 1, 75-7, for the 14th century feuing of lands of Kelso.

286. Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis, i, 193-4.

It was not until the mid fifteenth century that feuing was employed in crown property and even then, until the 1490s, little effort was made to extend its scope. In March 1457-8, Pariliament gave feuing by the crown on royal estates its formalapproval and encouragement. The act stated that the 'king begyne and gif exempill to the laid and quhat prelate barone or frehalder that can accorde with his tenande apone setting of feuferme of his awin lande in all or in part our soverance lorde sall ratify and appreif the said assedacion sa that gif the tendadry hapynnis to bein in warde in the kingis handis the saide tenande sall remane with his feuferme unromovyt payande to the king siklik ferme endurande the warde as he dide to the lorde sa that it be set to a competent avail without preiudice to the king'[287]. However, this act did not initiate the process of feuing on crown estates, for, since 12 January 1450-1, the first recorded feu charter in the great seal register, James II had been engaged in the haphazard feuing of certain lands in Fife, Mar, Methven and Kyle Stewart.[289] Since feuing involved grants in heritage, the charters were required to be issued under the great seal. It is in the Register of the Great Seal that the movement towards feuing can be traced. Fifteen and twenty three such charters were recorded for the reigns of James II and III respectively, revealing little increase in the scope of the movements, but, with the early years of the reign of James IV, there was an augmentation in their numbers in the register. From 1488 to 1500, and from the latter date to 1508 the charters numbered 20 and 36 respectivly, but after 1508 there appears to have been a great surge, for in the next 6 years, there were 81 such entries.[289] However, the Register of the Great Seal did not represent the total extent of the

---

287. APS, ii, 49.

288. RMS, ii, 406, 528, 533, 567, 572, 580, 581, 603. : ER, vi, 156, 254, 357.

289 The figure for the reign of Jame II, involved counting the feuing of the town of Falkland, which encompassed charters 707-728, as one charter, as it represented merely the division of a single portion of crown estate.

feuing of crown lands, as the feuing of many portions of land, especially after 1508, recorded in the king's rentals, did not find a place in the surviving records of the Great Seal. To appreciate fully the surge of 1508, large areas of crown property within the earldoms of Fife, Strathearn, Menteith, the Forest of Ettrick, and the lordship of Methven, as recorded in the king's rentals, were feued. This represented the real extention of the system of feuing.[290]

There can be little doubt that the incentive to feu royal estates was derived from the desire, on the part of the crown, for increased profits, but the success of the policy also demanded the existance of a favourable economic climate. By the first decade of the sixteenth century, there is evidence that such a situation did exist. The declining population during most of the fourteenth and substantial part of the fifteenth century, with its inherent effect on the demand for land and the level of rents, seems to have halted sometime around the last quarter of the fifteenth century. However, in many of the regions of Europe an upward demographic movement was initiated not long after 1450, although in certain areas the recovery was delayed until as late as the last quarter of the fifteenth century, but after 1500 a sustained growth in the level of population was in evidence in most regions.[291] There is little evidence concerning the movement of population in Scotland during this period, but there is no reason to asume that it did not follow the general European trend. This being so, the reign of James IV must have coincided with an upward movement in the population, thus creating a demand not only for landed holdings but also for agricultural produce. This renewed demographic pressure on land would have resulted in a rise in the value of real estate, a fact which undoubtedly facilitated James IV's encouragement of the feu system

---

290. ER, xiii, 589-656, see rentals for details.

291. The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, ii, 20-4

with its augmented rents. The rise in the value of landed estates can be sufficiently demonstrated from the evidence gained from retours. In most of the retorus which have survived for the reign of James IV, it is evident that the present value of estates tended to be far in excess of valuations 'in time of peace', that is before the wars of independance. For instance, in 1508 a retour serving Adam Hepburn as heir to the estates of the late Patrick, earl of Bothwell stated that the lands of the lordship of Liddesdale and an additional 39 husbandlands were assessed 'now' at £300 and £40 respectively but 'in time of peace' they retained a value of only £100 and £10.[292] More conclusively, on 6 October 1478 two thirds of the lands of Morham and the entire lands of Ugston were respectively assessed at 20 marks and 10 marks both 'new extent' and 'in time of peace' but in a subsequent retour of 23 October 1508, the latter valuation was quoted at a similar rate but the current value of the lands in question had risen to 40 marks and 20 marks respectively.[293] This rise in the value of private estates must also have been reflected in royal property and towards the end of the fifteenth century, crown tenants, faced with more or less static rent assessments for most of the century, must have found the arrangement extremely profitable. There can be little doubt that, by the end of the fifteenth century, the level of farm extracted annually from the royal demesne, which had remained largely unaltered since the beginning of the century, had got sadly out of step with the real value of the land. Thus, the substantial augmentations in rents which accompanied longer leases and feuing were simply and attempt on the part of the crown to ensure that the annual farm levied on royal tenants was more in line with the actual potential of crown property.

The early feus arranged during the reigns of James II and III were not so much commercial contracts but more an additional vehicle of patronage. Royal patronage was prevalent in most of the regions of crown patrimony and

---

292. Fraser, The Scotts of Buccleuch, ii, 111-2.

293. SRO, Calendar of Yestir Writs, GD 28/186, 309.

these early feus proved to be just another cog in this vast system. Generally, the annual farm demanded by the crown for the feu status was invariably not too dissimilar from the rent extracted from the land when in leasehold. On 25 October 1455 and lands of Balcarres and Ballinkirk were feued to Robert Hunter and his heirs at an annual farm of £8-13-4, 21½ bolls of corn, 26 bolls, 3 firlots of barley and 48 poultry, exactly the same rent as that which was demanded for the lands when in leasehold.[294] It was not uncommon for the feu to be associated with the payment of a fee to the tenant concerned. For instance, Robert Hunter, who retained the office of usher of the king's chamber, received part of his fee from the farms of the lands of Balcarres and Ballinkirk.[295] In 1451 the annual farm levied from the lands of Montcastle, Portnellan, Dullater and the island in Loch Vennachar in the lordship of Strathgartney as recorded in the account of the chamberlain of Menteith, amounted to £10 but, on 9 June 1452 the same lands were feued to Andrew Balfour 'for his faithful service' for an annual 'reddendo' of only £8.[296] In 1457 the chamberlain was instructed by means of a royal letter under the privy seal to extract only £8 annually from Andrew Balfour for the duration of his life [297] and when, in 1467, the accountant was charged with £11-6-8 as the new rent for the lands in question, it was stated that the feufarm was to amount to £10 annually.[298] Similarly, in 1457 the chamberlain of Fife was allowed an overcharge of £1-6-8 for the annual farm of the lands of the Halls of Rossy as they had been feued by the king to William Bonar at £4 per annum although the accountant was charged annually at 8 marks.[299] This situation persisted

---

294. RMS, ii, 603. ER, v, 466, 469.
295. ER, vi, 80, 252, 369, 417, 565, 613.
296. ER, v, 475-6. RMS, ii, 567.
297. ER, vi, 357.
298. ER, vii, 489.
299. ER, vi, 254.

until 1502 when John Bonar lost his right to the feu, probably because his ancestor had failed to acquire legally binding proof of his concession, and John was forced to accept the land in leasehold.[300] Although these early feus assumed many of the attributes associated with the feus settled during the reigns of James IV and V, there appears to have been certain irregularities. For instance, in 1456 William Bonar claimed that the rent for his feu of the Halls of Rossy was fixed at £4 annually but in 1487 the same lands were claimed in feu by James Bonar at an annual farm of 10 marks, that is the 'reddendo' seems to have been raised sometime between these two dates.[301] On 22 November 1477 a third of the lands of Duffus, the lands of Pittendreich and others within the earldom of Moray were feued to James Douglas for an annual farm of £28-12-3 and 8 chalders of barley but James's heirs were to gain entry to the fief on payment of an extra annual rent (the normal procedure was to demand an entry fine of double the amount of the yearly Farm) and, every seven years, James was to submit to the crown an additional £28-12-3 for a grassum which was not normally associated with the system of feuing.[302] Any increase in rent which did occur in these early feus tended to be small in extent when compared with the rent doubling that was prominent in the reign of James IV. The feu of the Barony of Leswalt and other lands in the lordship of Galloway to Alexander Kennedy in 1487-8, involved an increase of only £10, to £94-14-2, while the feu of the thanage of Kintore in 1473 to Alexander Lodey of Wardris at an annual farm of £51-2-8 recorded an increase of only £5-2-8.[303] The granting of a feu in reward for services rendered was frequently employed by James III. On the 18 March 1482-3, James III granted to Andrew Wood, living in Leith, the feu of the lands of Largo at exactly the same farm as had

---

300. ADC, ii, 492. ER, xii, 618.

301. ER, vi, 254, ix, 654.

302. RMS, ii, 1334.

303. RMS, ii, 1718, 1141.

been charged to the accountant of Fife as far back as 1456, with the explanation that this grant was in return for services rendered by him on land and sea, in peace and war, inside and outside Scotland, especially against the English, and for damage sustained by him and risks to which he was exposed.[304]

The failure of the crown before James IV to cash in on the full financial potential of the system of feuing was due not only to the desire to employ this arrangement as a means of augmenting the stock of royal patronage but also because the demand for real estate had not yet risen sufficiently to absorb any dramatic increase in rents. However, under James IV, and especially after 1500, the 'raison d'etre' of the feu was that it was designed to substantially augment the revenue derived from royal property. The tone was set by a Parliamentary statute issued on 15 March 1503-4 when it was recorded that it was legal for the crown to set his lands, both annexed and unannexed, in feufarm to any parson 'sa that it be not in diminitioun of his rentale, grassoumes nor all uther dewitez and sett with sic claus as our soverane thikis expedient'.[305] The fact that the heritable feu holding was now, for the first time, legally associated with the annexed property of the crown, which under the terms of the 1455 statute 'were annext to the crown perpetualy to remane the quhilk may not be giffyn away nother in fee nor in franktenement til ony persone',[306] demonstrated the crown's eagerness to extend feufarm to the entire royal demesne. Although a feu involved the granting of a fief in perpetuity, this contract still involved the payment of an annual farm to the crown which was at a rate in excess of the old lease farm. There is also evidence that . lay landlords were also feuing part of their property, with the desire for greater profit as their motivation.[307]

---

304. RMS, ii, 1563. ER, vi, 75, viii, 450.
305. APS, ii, 244.
306. APS, ii, 42
307. RMS, ii, 1081, 1560, 1204, 2386, 3681, 3823, 3845.

With the reign of James IV, feuing became increasingly associated with the king's frantic quest for increased revenue. The increasing demands of crown expenditure were, in three previous reigns, met by the physical enlargement of the crown's landed estate, especially through the forfeiture of noble estates, but this source had a limited potential. Instead of attempting to increase the actual property administered by the crown, James IV strove to increase the fiscal potential of the existing royal demesne. As seen above, long leases formed part of this movement, and feuing was an extention of this movement. James IV's vast expense on building, artillery, shipping and other items of luxury required the existance of a reliable source of ready cash. Feuing was one of the means by which James could achieve this desire.

The substantial rent increasing of the early sixteenth century on crown property was the result of substituting the prevailing fifteenth century short, 3 or 5 year, lease for the longer 9 year lease or the hereditary feu. The rising value of land and a desire for greater security on the part of the majority of crown tenants provided the necessary stimulus. In return for greater security of tenure, the crown demanded an increased rent which frequently amounted to at lease double the previous level. Initially, the financial rewards to the crown were substantial and represented a further effort on the part of James IV to fight the rising costs of a Renaissance style of government. This movement assumed different forms from one portion of royal property to another. On 4 March 1509-10 a substantial part of the king's property within the earldom of Fife was set in feufarm. The result was a dramatic increase in the gross farm charged to the chamberlain; in 1508 that official was charged with a gross annual farm of £613-4-11, 33 chalders of wheat, 63 chalders of barley, 57 chalders of oats, 2 bolls of oatmeal and 1 chalder, 4 bolls of bere but in 1513, after much of the property had been feued, the gross cash farm had increased to £966-7-1, although there was

little alteration in the kind rent.[308] This sharp rise in the level of rents must have put a severe strain on the capital resources of a prospective tenant or group of tenants. Not only was the feuar required to make annual payment of the augmented farm but he was also forced to submit a large entry fine following his acceptance of the contract. In 1508 the lands and mill of Balcarres were leased for three years at an annual rent of £6-13-4, 1 chalder, 5 bolls, 1 firlot, 2 pecks of wheat, 1 chalder, 10 balls, 3 firlots of barley and 48 poultry but in March 1509-10 they were feued to George Crichton, in Stirling, in fee and Margaret Crichton in liferent, for an annual farm of £25-14-7 and practically the same grain farm with a fine for the new infeftment amounting to a further £30.[309] Similarly, the lands of Ballinkirk, formerly leased for an annual rent of £3-6-8 were feued to John Gib, alias Gray John, the previous lessee, for a farm of £10 and an entry fine of £50. John Douglas, a household servant in the royal wine cellar, submitted an annual farm of £8 along with the usual grain and poultry rent and an entry fine of £26-13-4 for the feu of the lands of Balbreky which had been previously leased for a rent of £4 annually.[310] Lands which were assigned, granted in liferent or used to pay fees and pensions were not feued at this stage. For instance, the lands and meadow of Parkhill, which had been granted to Andrew Doule in liferent, were not set in feu at this juncture and annual farm remained at the same level of £16.[311]

In the case of the property within the earldom of Strathearn, the transformation was more gradual. In 1502 most of the royal property within that area was leased for a term of 9 years at double the rent and, because

---

308. ER, xiii, 2, 502.

309. ER, xiii, 612, 618. On 24 June 1511 the feu was, with the consent of George Crichton and by royal precept, transferred to sir John Stirling of Keir at the same terms. ER, xiii, 619.

310. ER, xiii, 620.

311. ER, xiii, 4, 155, 236, 420, 614, 618.

of this increase, the grassum, normally due from tenants at the outset of a fresh lease, was generally remitted. In 1510 most of the property was set in feu with a further augmentation in the annual farm of approximately one third.[312] The result on the gross farm charged to the chamberlain of Strathearn was dramatic, in 1501 he was responsible for the collection of a gross receipt of £372-10/- from crown property, in the following year the amount had augmented to £668-13-4 with grassums of only £85, but by 1512 the gross annual farm had attained the level of £874-10/-.[313] In addition, in his account for 1510, the chamberlain was charged with the collection of £652-13-4, the entry fines liable for payment during that particular year.[314] The tenancy of individual portions of property within the earldom was also becoming an increasingly expensive proposition. The lands of Raterne, for instance, were leased for an annual rent of £8 during the fifteenth century, but, in 1502, they were let to sir William Stirling of Keir for 9 years at a farm of £16 no grassum was levied and when, in February 1509-10 the lands were set in feufarm to Luke Stirling, the farm was settled at £32 annually with an entry fine of the same figure.[315] The reasons for the intervening 9 year leases are probably twofold, firstly it provided the crown with two opportunities to step up the rent and secondly, it is probable that the economic climate was not sufficiently developed in the earldom to enable the crown to extract the maximum return from feuing. This latter observation is borne out by the fact that, in 1502, although the rent was doubled, prospective tenants had not amassed sufficient capital resources for a grassum to be levied. In Ettrick Forest, the royal property was leased for 9 years in 15 April 1501 and subsequently feued from 1510.[316] The

---

312. ER, xii, 624-9, xiii, 643-7.

313. ER, xi, 344, xii, 48, xiii, 438.

314. ER, xiii, 314.

315. ER, xii, 624, xiii, 644.

316. ER, xi, 457-60, xiii, 649-656.

gross farm charged to the chamberlain in 1502 amounted to £525-13-4, but following the 9 year lease, the annual farm rose sharply to over £2,670 but when the estates were feued in 1510 the gross farm remained roughly the same at £2,672-16-8.[317] It is likely that, in 1501 the crown over-estimated the financial potential of the property in Ettrick and was unable to increase the farm to any marked drgree nine years later. However, the position varied, for, in 1501 the two steads of Yare were leased for 9 years to William Ker and his son William for an annual rent of £47 (the previous rent amounted to only £12) but in 1510 the lands were set in feu to the same persons at an increased farm of £60 and a similar entry fine, but, on the other hand, the lands of Elthreave, leased in 1499 at a rent of £6, were let for 9 years to Alexander, lord Hume for a farm of 100 marks but, when the lands were feued to lord Hume in 1510, the farm had been reduced to £50.[318] Although the royal estates within the lordship of Galloway were leased for 9 years in 1503, they were not subsequently feued as in the case of Ettrick Forest and Strathearn but simply relet for a further term of 5 years.[319]

For James IV, that is in the short term, the financial prospect of systematic introduction of longer leases and feus to crown property were extremely encouraging. For instance, from the twelve tenants of the lands of Cash in 1508, the crown derived an annual farm of £8-1-4 with a quantity of grain and poultry and a grassum of £6-13-4 but when the property was feued to Alexander and Thomas Scott in 1511, the crown received a farm of £24-6-8, the same quantity of grain and poultry and an initial entry fee of £24-6-8.[320] It is no wonder that the prospects of such profits encouraged

---

317. ER, xi, 320, xii, 34, xiii, 410.

318. ER, xi, 399, 457, xiii, 653.

319. ER, xii, 650-7, xiii, 602-7.

320. ER, xiii, 614, 621.

James IV to establish the feu as the principal means of exploiting the royal demesne. Hoever, the long term effect of the systematic feuing of royal property was not such an attractive proposition. It is clear that the sixteenth century price revolution adversely effected the financial value of the feufarm. Assuming the price trend in Scotland was not too dissimilar to the overall European tendancy, it is likely that the price index rose gradually from the early sixteenth century and from around 1550 the upward surge of price advanced sharply for the next century.[321] Thus, those persons with sufficient capital to afford the heavy initial outlays on royal feus were set, during the sixteenth century, to reap the profits of their investment. Since the feu represented a hereditary, and therefore an inalianable, concession in which the terms of the contract were established in perpetuity, the feuar was presented not only with security of tenure but also the payment of an annual farm which could not be legally augmented as long as his heirs retained the holding. Also, as the emphasis was placed on the payment of the annual farm in cash rather than in kind, the continual fall in the value of the Scottish currency during the sixteenth century considerably eased the burden of such payments. But the price rise was the largest single factor in the viability of the feu. As the price of agricultural produce rose during the sixteenth century, the feuar was able to cash in on the increasing profits from the direct exploitation of the land, a benefit which bypassed the crown as superior, forced to accept only a fixed cash return. Where farms in kind were retained, as in Fife,[322] the crown did not lose out to the same extent, but such payments tended to form only a small proportion of the feu 'reddendo'. Although the crown did not derive any real benefit from the rise in the price of agricultural produce, it was not immune from the disadvantages. Despite the payment of certain king rents, a large part of the household

---

321. Lythe, The Economy of Scotland, 109-111.

322. ER, xiii, 623-5.

supplies were purchased, and as the cost of food rose, so also did the expense of provisioning the king and his household. In addition, the cost of industrial products, especially those purchased from abroad, was also following an upward trend at this juncture. In conclusion, although the costs of government advanced steadily during the sixteenth century, there was no corresponding increase in the returns derived from royal property, thus, creating a servere fiscal crisis.

Sir Thomas Craig of Riccarton after the Union of the Crowns commented on the effect of debasement and rising prices on the system of feuing, 'Later, acts of dissolution were invented which, under the pretext of increasing the annual revenue arising from the crown patrimony, permitted many specious alienations. But these turned out to be most detrimental in their results to the crown; for they were made in consideration of an annual return in money which the debasement of the currency caused to depreciate in value.....Things have gone so far that while, to begin with, an ounce of silver was worth from two to three shillings - at which rate silver coin was minted and passed into currency - its value has now risen to sixty shillings; with the result that, while the amount of money payable under the crown grants of patrimonial lands remains the same, the values of everything else are abnormally inflated. A feuduty which in former times would have been the equivalent of the price of twelve oxen, or forty head of cattle, will hardly amount today to the price of a single ox, or about three head of cattle..... I must not be understood to be opposed to feufarm or as desirous of seeing them abolished. On the contrary, I believe the setting of lands in feufarm can be extended with the greatest public advantage over the whole of Scotland. It would improve the country, enrich the soil, extend cultivation, promote the planting of trees, thereof we have far too few, and give us better houses. But what I regard as a serious misfortune is that the feu farm duties are payable in coin, instead of in wheat, barley oats, wool, cloth, or in measured ounces of gold and silver.[323] It is

---

323. Criag Jus feudale, ed. Clyde, i, 304.

THE FINANCES OF THE SCOTTISH CROWN IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

CRAIG MADDEN

DEGREE OF PHD.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

1975

VOL II

interesting that much of what Craig maintained about the benefits of the feu holding reflected Major's complaints about the short leases prevalent in Scotland during his day. However, because large amounts of ready cash were required to pay for the large expenditure on artillery, shipping, building and the increased cost of government it is easy to visualise the reason behind James' employment of feuing as a means to achieving this end. Indeed James IV and his son James V, under whom the system of feuing on royal property attained its full maturity, would clearly have been far sighted monarchs if they had understood the full folly of their actions.

Concerning the early feu grants of the reigns of James II and III, of which mention was made above, the non commercial nature of the terms encouraged James IV to take steps to achieve their abolition on the pretext, as stated in the 1501 account of the Steward of Menteith with regard to the lands of Dullater and others, feued in 1452 to Andrew Balfour, that 'the said feufarm was granted in diminution of the rental.....and the lands are thought to be annexed to the crown'.[324] Recorded in the rentals from 1495 to 1501 are summonses to various tenants who claimed to hold their lands by feufarm to prove their right to their feu on an appointed date.[325] Some of these inquiries appeared to have been considered on the 18 March 1500-1 by special commissioners appointed under the white wax.[326] The feuars under scurtiny were ordered to 'schaw til oure soverance lord and til his commissaris thare haldingis of the landis abonewrittin, togidder with thare charteris and evidentis, gif thai ony have, of the sadis landis, be quhat tytill and be quhat service thai clame the sadis landis til be haldin of the kingis hienes as superior thairof, and til underly and do that thai ar

---

324. ER, v, 597, xi, 326. : RMS, ii, 567.

325. ER, x, 750. In 1495 the feuar of the lands of the Halls and Easter Rossy was assigned the 8 February to prove his claim.
ER, xi, 425. The feuar of Balgarvie was assigned 6 July next in the lease of 1499.

326. ADC, ii, 492.

bound to under the perell of the law thairapone folowand'.[327] As most of these lands were held for a farm far below what the crown could now hope to gain and since, under the existing arrangement, the king could not legally raise the level of the farms, the king employed various pretexts to oust these feuars. To release these lands the king asserted that some of these feu claims had been granted during a minority, or were among the lands annexed to the crown, and the charters were of doubtful validity. Sir John Lundy, who had laid claim to the feu of the lands of Thomaston was unable to produce any proof for his assertion and finally was forced to submit to the king's will.[328] The practical result of these decisions varied considerably; the lands of Easter Rossy and the Halls of Rossy were relet in leasehold to the man who had claimed to hold them in feu at a rent higher than his feufarm, while the lands of Balgarvie remained unlet until 1513.[329] The fate of the lands of Drumtennand in the earldom of Fife provided a good example of the manner in which the king extracted the maximun financial benefit from the subversion of these early feus. On 30 October 1458 the lands of Drumtennand were feued to Thomas Anderson, burgess of Cupar for an annual farm of £4 in cash and a quantity of grain and poultry.[330] This arrangement was tolerated by the crown until 1499 when his descendant, also named Thomas Anderson, was assigned 7 July to demonstrate his right to the feu in the Exchequer.[331] On 18 March 1500-1 Anderson was ordered 'to disist from occupying the lands foresaid, and the King to appropriate them'.[332] The result was that Anderson accepted a lease of the lands for three years in April 1502 at an annual rent of £4, a grassum of 10 marks and an entry fine of 20 marks.[333] Finally, on 4 March 1509-10

---

327. ADC. ii, 492.

328. See Appendix No. A/8(g)

329. ER, i,, 6, 616, 618, 690, xiii, 611.

330. RMS, ii, 636.

331. ER, xi, 428.

332. ADC, ii, 493.

333. ER, xii, 618.

Thomas Anderson and his wife Elizabeth Balfour regained the feu of the lands of Drumtennand at the increased annual farm of £10 and an entry fine of the same value.[334]

There seems to have been no fixed rule concerning the terms of the contract settled between the crown and the feuar. Undoubtedly, several factors influenced the exact nature of the settlement. The precise extent of farm increase and the level of entry fine demanded by the superior was dependant on local conditions. It would be true to say that the more fertile regions of royal property afforded a greater augmentation in the level of farm than that achieved in the poorer areas. For instance, the lands of Ardate in the earldom of Fife, one of the richest regions in Scotland, were, prior to 1510, leased to various tenants for an annual rent of £8-6-8, but, subsequent to that date, were feued for an annual farm of £29-6-8 and an entry fine of the same rate.[335] In contrast, since the accession of James III, the lands of Fettercairn and Arbuthnot had been leased to various tenants for an annual farm of £77-5/-, in November 1488 Andrew Wood, the king's usher, was granted the lease of the entire estates for life at the usual farm and, on 10 March 1498-9 the holding was converted to feufarm with no increase in the yearly levy.[336] Similarly, in the latter part of the fifteenth century, the lands of Glencairny were leased to John Grant of Freuchie at an annual rent of £60 but, on 4 February 1498-9, the same property, with the addition of the lands of Balnadalach and the mill, whose farm was assessed at £4, was set in feu to Grant for a farm of £71, representing only a small annual augmentation.[337] During the second half of the fifteenth century, the lordships of Urquhart and Glenmoriston were

---

334. RMS, ii, 3432. ER, xiii, 620.

335. ER, xiii, 623.

336. ER, vii, 384, x, 650, xi, 171-2.

337 ER, ix, 47, x, 523. RMS, ii, 2478. Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant ii, No.51.

let for a rent of £100 yearly, but, when the property was feued to John Grant of Freuchie on 8 December 1509, the feufarm was settled at only 2 marks above that demanded when the lands were in lease.[338] The influence of the feuar must also have been a determining factor in the settling of the terms of a feu. On 31 January 1495-6, John, lord Drummond, one of the principal supporters of the prince at Sauchieburn in 1488, was granted the feu of the lands of Drummond in the lordship of Menteith in return for an annual farm of £44, an augmentation of only £4 over the lease rent.[339] Also, even in the first decade of the sixteenth century, the demands of royal patronage compelled the crown to provide selected feuars with bargain settlements. These favoured feuars were rewarded with only small increases in the annual farm and there are indications that some of them were still paying 'the old rent' (that is, the farm associated with the previous short 3 or 5 year lease) which was probably far below the current value of the property concerned. On 23 January 1511-12 the mill of Bello was feued to John Rankin at an annual farm of 10 marks which represented the same rate of payment as when the lands were held in leasehold.[340] The meadow of Auchtermuchty was, on 4 September 1511, feued to James Kincraigie at an annual farm of £5, exactly the same figure as he had previously paid for a five year lease of the holding. In addition, there was no mention of an entry fine, from which it can only be assumed that no such duty was levied.[341] The granting of a feu was also a useful vehicle for the repayment of royal debts and with the shortage of available cash, a means of paying for the performance of royal service. On 22 February 1506-7 Master William Ogilvy of Geddes was granted the feu of the lands of Strathdearn, Petty, Brackley and the mill of Conich in Inverness-shire for an annual farm of £129. However, on 12 March 1512-3 the same feu was

---

338. RMS, ii, 3390. Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, ii, No.59, 60. ER, xi, 107.

339. RMS, ii, 2299. Although his right to the feu was queried in May 1499, his claim was upheld. ER, xi, 416.

340. ER, xiii, 625.

341. ER, xiii, 616, 623.

confirmed to Ogilvy and his wife, Alison Roule, but at a vastly reduced annual farm of £50. This gift was in return for 'grete labouris, travele and expens maid be the said schir William in divers his service within the realme and outsith, pass and in his speciale erandis in Ingland and France divers tymes, and for the soume of 2,000 lib paid and deliverit to his grace in reddy nomerit money, of the quhilk he haldis him wele content' and the feu was now granted to Ogilvy and his wife for the annual payment of £50 'and dischargis the remanent of the saidis malez that the saidis landis war wont to pay, lik as in contenit in the said last gift'.[342] On 27 March 1511 John Leslie of Wardris received the feu of the lordship of Garioch at and annual farm similar to that paid by the previous lessee, William Forbes of Tollis, since he had entered into an exchange with the king which involved the alienation of Leslie's property in Balcomy in Fife.[343] However, despite these exceptions, the underlying motivation behind feuing was the desire to augment the fiscal return from crown property and most of these contracts invovled a considerable increase in the annual farm.

The terms of settlement negotiated for each feu varied considerably. As with long leases, the feus of crown patrimony demanded considerable capital resources on the part of the recipient in order to be able to sustain the higher farm and the large entry fine. Inevitably this movement favoured the more affluent sections of society. In general, the social status of the immediate royal tenant rose with the introduction of feuing. In 1508 the lease of the lands of Cash in Fife was divided into twelve separate blocks paying an aggregate annual farm of £8-1-4 but when the property was feued in March 1509-10, the initial outlay of £24-6-8 for the first year's farm and a further £24-6-8 for the entry fine, was beyond the capital resources of these small tenants and the feu was granted to two relatives of sir William Scott of Balwery.[344] Part of the lands of Newtown of Reras in Fife were, in 1508,

---

342. RSS, i, 1435, 2484. RMS, ii, 3324, 3819.
343. RSS, i, 1724. RMS, ii, 3556.
344. ER, xiii, 614, 621.

leased to David Hunter, Micheal Reid, Henry Wemyss and Stephen Ednam for an annual rent of £2-10/- and a quantity of grain and livestock but, in March 1509-10, the property was feued to David Hunter and his wife, Margaret, for a farm of £12-3-4 and the same kind 'reddendo' on condition that Hunter did not remove the other tenants during their lifetime.[345] Similarly, on 5 September 1511, four husbandlands, 28 cottage acres and the mill of Ballincrieff were brought under a single feuar, master John Murray of Blackbarony for an increased farm of just under £4.[346] During the feuing of the earldom of Fife, the 9 tenants of Ferny and the 6 tenants of Mill of Bello, who held the lands by the last three year lease, were replaced in the feu by Florentine Admouchty and John Rankin respectively.[347] This trend must not be overstressed, for the feuing of the king's property in Fife recorded many other examples of the association of small tenants which succeeded in sustaining the increased financial demands of a feufarm and remaining in possession of their holding.[348] Even where smaller tenants were not forced to surrender their holdings, the increased payments demanded by the crown must have been a bitter blow. The tenants of Ardate, in the earldom of Fife, for instance, were forced to pay an annual rent of £29-6-8 in cash and a similar entry fine, where they had previously rendered only £8-6-8 in rent, the kind levy remaining static.[349] However the increased outlay contributed to a decrease in the number of tenants, for one half was, as before, divided equally between two tenants, the other half previously divided among seven, was now divided among four. Smaller tenants were not unnaturally reluctant to pay all that the crown demanded, but, in the light of competition for such holding, they were often forced

---

345. ER, xiii, 612-9.

346. RMS, ii, 3643. ER, xiii, 609. The rent in leasehold amounted to £16-10-8 in cash and in feu, the farm amounted to £20.

347. ER, xiii, 423, 611, 620, 623.

348. Appendix No B/3(g), see lands of Wester Rossy, Cash, Freuchie, Ardate, Kings Barns, Auchtermuchty, Catill and others.

349. ER, xiii, 610, 623.

either to pay or accept a diminution in their status. On 29 July 1511, the lands of Luthre, in Fife, were feued to Andrew Kinlock, David and Walter Paterson for an annual farm of £80, an increase of £26-13-4 on the previous rent submitted by 12 tenants, but 2 days later, the latter, forced to pay the full increase as the only alternative to losing their holding, were granted the feu on payment of a farm of £80.[350] Small tenants who were unable or unwilling to pay the augmented farm were frequently reduced in status to sub-tenants of the crown and an extra layer was placed on the pyramid exploiting the royal demesne. Although this action removed the necessity for these tenants to pay the large entry fine demanded by the crown on the acceptance of a feu they were not, however, absolved from the effects of the increased farm. With the introduction of feuing and the inevitable increase in the annual farm, the position of many sub-tenants must have deteriorated financially. In the 'Complaynt of Scotlande' the fate of the small sub-tenant was highlighted, 'the malis and fermes of the grond that i laubyr is hychtit to sic ane price, that it is fors to me and wyf and bayrns to dring wattir'.[351] The ramifications of the augmented annual contribution of the feuar was felt throughout the entire complex of tenants whe were, in turn, forced to submit a lager rent to their immediate superior. The crown was anxious to avoid the immediate displacement of these small tenants for whom the king was no longer their immediate superior. Part of the agreement included in the feu contract for the lands of Cash, was that the previous small tenants, whom Alexander and Thomas Scott had replaced, were not to be removed from the lands during their lives, provided they paid their share of the annual farm and they were absolved from any part in the payment of the entry fine.[352] By the end of the sixteenth century, it is

---

350. ER, xiii, 623-4.

351. The Complaynt of Scotlande, ed., Murray, Early English Text Society, 122.

352. ER, xiii, 621.

more than likely that many crown feuars were actively engaged in rack renting and evicting many of his smaller tenants. Despite the retribution of Lindsay and other writers of the same ilk, the impetus towards such activities was bound up with the ecomonic climate of the period. In an era of considerable demographic growth, rising prices and substantial pressure on the existing land market, the feuar, faced with increased competition for his holdings and the prospect of large profits from the produce of the land, was encouraged to extract large rents from his sub-tenants, who, if unwilling or unable to pay, were easily substituted. However, the postion of the smaller tenant was further exacerbated by the fact that, although the feuar had acquired absolute security of tenure, his sub-tenants had not and were, therefore, open to exploitation and dismissal. Care was taken to ensure that previous rights were not infringed to any great degree. Although the lordship of Balquhidder was set in feu on 6 February 1509-10, a proviso was made that certian tenants of the lordship had access to the wood of Invermenty for their own use without causing undue distruction.[353] In 1510 the lands of Fordew, Glentarkane and Balmuk were feued to Mary Forrester and her son, John Drummond, on condition that the gift, concession and lease held by William Drummond, alias Spicehouse, of the king were to continue for his lifetime.[354] How much attention was actually paid to such provisions is difficult to determine but it would be doubtful if either the crown or the feuar paid any more than lip service to these conditions.

A large amount of literature has been written on the effect of feuing in Scotland which has received a bad press from many of the leading scholars.

---

353. ER, xiii, 637.

354. ER, xiii, 645.

Writing on the plight of the smaller tenants, sir David Lindsay maintained:

'No begins ane plague amang them new,
That gentill men thair steadings taks in feu.
Thus man they pay great ferme of lay their steid.
And sum ar plainlie harlit out be the heid,
And ar distroyit without God on them rew. [355]

The cost of a feuholding sometimes forced a tenant to accept a partner in his holding, in order to defray the increased expenses. The lands of Kershop in Ettrick were set in feu to John Murray at £24 annually, but later, James Murray was associated with him in the holding.[356] The amount of increase in the rent varied, tempered obviously by the pressure of competition for the feuholding and the economic state of the land in question. In Fife, the annual farm of the lands of Wester Rossy rose from £10 to £24 annually after feuing, while that of the Westend of Stramiglo rose only from £8 to £10-13-4. These variations are shown to their best effect in the feuing of Ettrick Forest, where the previous leasing settlements had been conducted on the basis of £6 rent for every steid or holding, but when these holdings were feued in 1510, the terms arranged alternated considerabley. For instance, the lands of Deidhope were let for 3 years to Stephen Scott in April 1499 for a rent of £6, on the conversion to a 9 year lease in 1501, the property was leased to Alexander, lord Hume for a rent of £24, but, in 1510, the stead was finally feued to Scott for the reduced farm of £10 and an entry fine of the same figure. In contrast, the stead of Gaircleuch and Blackhouse was first leased to John Achilmer for a rent of £6 in 1499, two years later the 9 year lease cost Alexander, Lord Hume and his brother Patrick an annual rent of 100 marks and when feued to sir John Stewart

---

355. Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, ed., D. Jamer, ii, 249.

356. ER, xiii, 650.

of Traquair in 1510, the farm and the entry fine were each settled at £50.[357]

However, the majority of feu contracts were settled within these two extremes and, it is likely that, apart from variations in the value of individual holdings, the level of farm was largely determined by the intensity of competition for the holding. Generally, it would be true to say that the higher the farm achieved by the crown the greater the demand for the feu. In Ettrick forest, the augmentation in the level of rent in most holdings between 1499 and 1510 represented an increase of three or four times the original farm, the result not only of the pressure of a rising population but also the fact that the fifteenth century rent level, which had remained static since at lease the forfeiture of the forest to the crown in 1455, was well below the actual value of the estate and when reviewed in the first decade of the sixteenth century, the crown was able to large increases in the annual 'reddendos'.

There were instances when the crown was forced to accept a lowering of the feufarm. Several feus in Ettrick forest were cancelled when the tenant proposed was unwilling to accept the terms offered. The feu of the Middlestead of Langhope was refused on two separate occasions by John Cranstone and sir William Cranstone at an annual farm of £30, and was eventually set in feuferme to Alexander Scott for the lower farm of £25.[358] In the case of the feu of Eaststead of Gildhouse, the king was compelled by the tenant to lower his farm by £4, from £28 to £24 yearly, and in this settlement the tenant was aided by the fact that there was no other claimant for the feu to complicate the arrangements.[359] Refusal of the terms of the feu did not automatically result in a reduction of the rental, for, on occasions, the king managed to

---

357. See Appendix No.B/3(f) The section on the Ettrick rentals.

358. ER, xiii, 649, 650, 652.

359. ER, xiii, 651, 652.

sustain the level of the rental by accepting another tenant. The lands of Gaithop were first feued to Alexader Tait of Pyrne at £44 annually, but later the feu was transferred to James Stewart of Traquair at the same rate.[360] It is probable that the crown was over optamistic in the settling of many of the feus within Ettrick forest. On the refusal of David Murray to accept the feu of the stead of Williamshope at a farm of £26-13-4, the king was compelled to lower the farm to £24 before Andrew Ker, son of Ker of Mersington, could be encouraged to accept it.[361] However, it would appear that there was a substantial demand for royal feus in this region which was sufficiently strong to maintain a high level of rent. Although David Pringle and John Murray of Fallohill refused the feu of Douglascraig at £50 the same terms were accepted by Andrew, bishop of Moray.[362] Competition for crown feus varied from region to region. The remission of an entry fine due from John Elphinstone for the feu of half the stead of Glensax in the ward of Tweed by the commissioners was probably a sign that better terms could not be obtained.[363] Favourable terms were frequently achieved by the feuar in property for which there was little competition and where the latter could prove, to the satisfaction of the commissioners, that the land was sterile. On 24 May 1510, John Philipson and his wife, Mary, were granted the feu of the lands of Dundurn in the earldom of Strathearn for an annual 'reddendo' of £46-13-4, only £7 more than the rent demanded from the lands when in leasehold, and the entry fine was remitted on account of the sterility of the property 'through the consideration of the king's commissioners'.[364] In 1511 the chamberlain of Fife was charges with an annual feu farm of 100 marks, 9 chalders of wheat, 11 chalders of barley and 100 capons but, the following

---

360. ER, xiii, 652.

361. ER, xiii, 652, 653.

362. ER, xiii, 653.

363. ER, xiii, 655.

364. RMS, ii, 3470.

year, the cash 'reddendo' was reduced to 80 marks on account of the sterility of the ground and since the tenants were unable to pay the full amount, the king, through the advice of the commissioners, reduced the farm by 20 marks.[364A] In contrast, in a memorandum attached to the feu of the lands of Leitterbannochty it was stated that should sir Andrew Murray of Kippane refuse the terms of the feu contract sir William Murray of Tulibardine was to assume the holding at the same terms.[365] There is little doubt that competition for the crown feus facilitated the king's attempt to achieve the highest return possible from the feuing of his patrimony. In March 1509-10 the lands of Balbreky in Fife were feued to Archibald Beaton for an annual £8 and an entry fine of £20 but the contract was cancelled through the mandate of the treasurer and the commissioners. The motivation behind this action was the offer of more profitable terms by a third party and the feu was transferred to John Douglas, a household official in the king's wine cellar, who was willing to submit an increased entry of £26-13-4.[366] Although the king was, on occasions, forced to accept a diminuation on his original feufarm, nevertheless, the rentals of Ettrick forest revealed the extent of the increase that accompanied this movement. Concerning a selected 58 places in the Forest of Ettrick, the rental recorded in the 1499 lease for three years amounted to £379-10/-, with £377-5-4 payable as grassums, but after the feuing of Ettrick in 1510, the rental had risen to £1,871-3-4, with entry fines totalling £1,789-3-4.[367]

Although the feu, as compared with the lease, placed much larger demands on the tenant's financial resources, nevertheless, there does not seem to have been a large overturn of tenants. The evidence suggests that sitting tenants were given priority to secure the feu of their leases, if they were

---

364A. ER, xiii, 426-7.

365. ER, xiii, 646.

366. ER, xiii, 619, 620.

367. Appendix No.B/3(f) The section on the Ettrick rentals.

able to strike an agreement with the crown over terms. In 1509 Master James Henrieson protested that 'sen the tennentis of the erledom of Marche war summoned to this day to tak thair fewis and na man com to tak thaim that thairfor the lordis mycht sett the saidis landis to other tennentis'.[368] If the existing tenant was unwilling to accept the terms for the feu, the crown had no hesitation in offering it to another suitor. In a memorandum of 17 June 1510, it was stated that John Murray of Fallohill 'has tane and takis the xvi stedis (in the forest of Ettrick) that ar now at xvi merkis for the saidis sowme and alsmekill entra silver and with this condition, ilk genteman to haf his awin stedis on the pricis heos feris thaim to, and gif thai refuse thaim as he feris, the sammyn the said John of Murray to haf the saide takkis, and the entra silver to be payit now'.[369] Out of 38 portions of land feued in the earldom of Fife, only in the case of 8 did the land change hands outwith transfers within the family.[370] In Ettrick a similar trend was evident, for, between 1499 and 1510, when the lands were leased first for three years, then 9 years, and eventually set in feu, only 6 out of 57 portions of land revealed a complete alteration in family holding.[371]

---

368. ER, xiii, 656.

369. ER, xiii, 649.

370. ER, xiii, 610-625.

371. See Appendix No.B/3(f) Ettrick Section.
Of the 57 lands in Ettrick in the appendix.

28½ witnessed continuous family occupation of the lands from 1499 to the feu.

13 witnessed continuous family occupation from the 9 years lease in 1501 to the feu.

9½ witnessed similar family occupation for the 3 year lease in 1499 and feu though not for the 9 year lease in 1501.

6 revealed continual charge in the family in occupation.

There seems little doubt that the sitting tenant was encouraged to accept the feu of his holding and that the threat of alienating the feu to a third party was often employed to coerce the former into agreeing to the higher terms. In 1502 the lands of Wester Glentarf within the earldom of Strathearn were let for 9 years to Murrok, the widow of William Neilson but when the lands were feued in February 1509-10 it would seem that the contract was at first offered to William Maxton for a farm of £8, with Murrok retaining only a life interest in the lands, but the entry was cancelled and, on 24 May 1510, the feu was accepted by Murrok and her son Maurice Neilson.[372] Many leaseholders were eagre to take advantage of the benefits offered by the introduction of feuing, even at the increased cost. On 28 April 1509, William Pringle and his son George were granted a further 9 year lease of the steads of Caddonlee, Torwoodlee and Toftness for an annual rent of £55. On 27 May 1510 Adam Scott of Tuschelaw was bound to take the feu of the stead of Gilmynscleuch in Ettrick for a farm of £28 and the same in entry silver should George Hume refuse his option 'becaus he (Scott) has ellis tane Cowinlaw the day abufwrittin in feuferme and disirit the said stede of Gilmynscleuch in few elikwise'.[373] However, on 8 April 1510, exactly a year later, William Pringle accepted the feu of these steads despite the fact that his lease had still 9 years still to run, for which he now submitted a farm of £60.[374] It is clear that many sitting tenants were eager to commute their leasehold into feufarm although lack of funds must have forced some to surrender their tenancies to others more able to meet the king's demands.

The distribution of family holdings within the forest of Ettrick from 1499 until after the feuing of the property, revealed that the number of holdings retained by each familyremained remarkably stable, and the majority of the increases that did occur could be traced back to the feuing of lands formerly

---

372. ER, xiii, 644, 647. The previous rent was only £5-6-8.

373. ER, xiii, 649.

374. RSS, i, 1859. ER, xiii, 655.

held by the king in steilbow.[375] The use of magnates and leading barons and lairds in the peripheral areas of the country as lessees of large portions of crown property, was continued when these areas were feued.[376] As mentioned above, the lands of Urquhart and Glenmoriston were feued to John Grant of Freuchie, who had previously held the lease, while, in 1489-90 the earl of Argyll held the lease of the lands of Rosneath for a payment of £35, and in 1509, the lease was converted into a feu at the annual farm of £41, the earl retained the holding.[377] The granting of long leases and feus of the royal demesne in the highland areas was not so much motivated by the desire for profit, as in the feuing of lands in central Scotland, more as the vehicle for giving crown agents in these areas greater security and power. One of the best illustrations is provided by the details of the grant of feu of the lands of Urquhart and Glenmoriston. Apart from the details concerning the rental, the feuar was bound to other conditions. He was held to provide and sustain 'unam suffultam lanceam, videlicet tres sufficientes equestres' for every £10 of land for the king's army for was outside the kingdom and armed persons for internal use, at the king's bidding, to repair and build a castle at Urquhart to protect the inhabitants from thieves and criminals, and details are given in the charter of the form of that castle, and he was to build bridges and stiles to facilitate easier communication within the lordship; in short, John was to ensure the stability of the area in question. Also in this charter, in common with most other feu charters, John had to comply with certain conditions, under pain of the loss of his feu.

Loss of the feu was incurred if the tenant was convicted of common theft, treason or murder, if the lands were sold or alienated without royal licence, and finally the heir of the holder of the feu was not permitted to

---

375. See Appendix No.B/3(f) Ettrick section.

376. See Appendix. No.B/3(f)

377. RMS, ii, 3334. : Hist. Mss. Commission, 4th Report, Mss of the Duke of Argyll, 483.

enter his holding without the king's consent.[378] Loss of the feu holding could also be the result of failure to make prompt payment of rent, for in the charter of feu of the lands of Glanchairny to John Grant of Freuchie, the later was to suffer such a loss if he failed to pay the rent for one term by the following term.[379] In fact the crown demanded fairly prompt payment of farms and other dues, for, in April 1510, the comissioner demanded that the tenants of Ettrick forest come and raise 'thair signatouris and pay thair grassoumez within xx days nixtocum, with certificatioun, and thai do nocht the lordis will sett thaim till utheris',[380]

Apart from the annual feufarm, various other conditions and provisos were detailed in many of the feu charters of the early sixteenth century. The feu charter granted to John Scott on 5 December 1507 concerning the forest and lands of Hanging was typical of the terms dectated to other feuars within the forest of Ettrick. In additinn to the commercial side of the contract, Scott was granted the power to build a tower on his holding to be stocked to resist invasion from the south and act as a bulwark against criminals, an entry fine double that of the annual farm was to be submitted at the entry of his heir and the superior's right of marriage was to be levied if the heir was unmarried at the time of his succession and the crown was entitled to the service of an equipped knight in wartime.[381] Several other charters contained various conditions. A feu charter of £22 of land in the lordship of Strathgartney to sir Henry Shaw of Grandtully specified that he and his heir were to preserve the king's forests in that area for the royal hunt and to ensure that 'le stalkeris' did not hold the lands bordering on the forests, under pain of forfeiture.[382] The lands of Easter Rossy were set in feu to

---

378. ER, xiii, 327-8. : Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, ii, No.59.

379. RMS, ii, 2478. : Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, ii, No.51.

380. ER, xiii, 649.

381. RMS, ii, 3154.

382. RMS, ii, 3193.

John Bonar in February 1508-9, on condition that he undertook to construct a dwelling house with gardens, orchards, and pools.[383] This probably represented one of the many attempts to encourage the feu holder to develope his holding, a fact which Major at an earlier date, stated was discouraged through the lack of tenurial secutiry, in the short fifteenth century leases.[384] The burgh of Falkland, under the jurisdiction of the chamberlain of Fife, was feued to various tenants on the 13 July 1459, for which they were required to provide hospitality to 244 men and horses and were also to build on their individual portions within 5 years.[385]

It would be true to say that the class which benefitted the most from the introduction of feuing to crown property was the class of landholder immediately below the magnate, commonly termed the laird. Large feus, especially those in remoter regions, were occasionally taken by members of the noble class, Alexander, lord Hume held substantial feus within the forest of Ettrick,[386] while John, lord Drummond was a prominant feuar in the earldom of Strathearn.[387] Following the surrender of the feu of the lordship of Strathbran by sir Patrick Hume of Polworth and sir Robert Lundy of Balcomy, between 17 and 30 November 1500, the lordship was re-set in feu to William, lord Ruthven and John, lord Drummond, each submitting an annual farm of £52-6-8.[388] At the other end of the social scale, groups of husbandmen and small landholders were able to pool their resources in order to retain their holdings, Eleven tenants combined, on 31 July 1511, in order to meet the increasedfinancial demands of the feu of the lands of Luthrie in Fife, in which each tenant was required to contribute according to the size of his

---

383: RMS, ii, 3314.

384. Major, History of Greater Britain, Scottish History, Society 10, 31.

385. RMS, ii, 706-28.

386. ER, xiii, 650-3.

387. ER, xiii, 643-7.

388. RMS, ii, 2555, 2557.

holding.[389] Although crown feus were expensive investments in the early sixteenth century, they seem to have been within the scope of many of the lairdly families. Many invested in feus according to their means both as a means of rounding off their own property and also as a vehicle for extending their influence beyond the confines of their personal estates. The family of Leslie of Wardris, whose territorial basis was centred round the area north of Aberdeen, acquired the feu of the crown property of Kintore on 30 September 1473 for a farm of £51-2-8 and, on 27 March 1511, the entire lordship of Garioch was feued to John Leslie for an annual 'reddendo' of £151 and a quantity of poultry and marts.[390] Similarly, John Grant of Freuchie, whose estates were concentrated in the shire of Elgin, extended his influence over other regions in the north with his investment in the feu of the crown property of Glencairny in February 1498-9 and the lordships of Urquhart and Glenmoriston in December 1509, demanding the annual aggregate farm of £172-6-8.[391] Further south, the entire lordship of Glenlion was, on 7 September 1502, feued to Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy, who had previously in March 1491-2 accepted the feu of the Port, island and fishing of Lochtay, the east part of Eddirgole and a section of the lands of Callelochan within the lordship of Deschier and Toyer, for which Campbell paid the crown £82-6-8 annually.[392] On 20 April 1510, the lands of Lupnoch and Lessintrule in Stirlingshire were feued to a prominant local laird, Robert Calendar of Powis, for an annual farm of £40.[393] In addition to the feu of an entire lordship, individual small feus within a lordship were readily acquired by representatives of this class. This is especially

---

389. ER, xiii, 623. The lands were previously leased for an annual rent of £53-6-8 but the feufarm was assessed at £90 annually, which figure also represented the entry fine demanded by the crown.

390. RMS, ii, 1141, 3244, 3556.

391. RMS, ii, 2478, 3390-2.

392. RMS, ii, 2019, 2428, 2668.

393. ER, xiii, 642.

evident in the feuing of the forest of Ettrick from April 1510 in which most of the feu holdings were absorbed by the leading laird families of the region. In Ettrick the accumulation of block of crown feus by powerful border lairds. Various members of the kin, both lairds, their sons and more distant relations purchased crown feus as a means of extending the influence of the family. From April 1510, various members of the Ker kin purchased the feus on royal property, the forest and steads of Bourhope and the east stead of Windydurris were settled on Andrew Ker of Cessford, Singlee and Ernheuch on a certain Andrew Ker, the middle stead of Hartwood on master Thomas Ker, Schestele on Andrew Ker of Ferniehurst, Williamhope on Andrew Ker, son of Ker of Mersington and Yare on William Ker, son of a certain William Ker, and his mother Christine, the aggregate cost of which amounted to £234-6-8 in annual farms and the same total in entry fines.[394] In similar vein, various members of the leading Scott families of Buccleuch, Tuschelaw and Howsplat investerd in royal feus whose annual farm amounted to over £237. The five sons of sir Patrick Crichton of Crandstone-Riddall were granted the feu of the royal property of Holylees, Thornielee, Catslak, Blackgrain, east and west Mountbenger, lands formerly held of the crown in steilbow, the total farm of which amounted to 500 marks although no entry fine was levied.[395] Many of the other leading border families plunged their resources into royal feus, the Pringles, the Murrays, the Turnbulls, the Cranstones and the Taits, Despite the initial heavy outlay involved in the purchase of these feus, the financial benefits reaped by feuars in the later sixteenth century must have been a powerful factor in the rise in fortune of many of these families, especially the Kers and the Scotts. The fiscal advantages to be gained from retention of the feus of crown property was undoubtedly one of the principal features in the rise of a powerful and wealthy middle class of landowner beneath the peerage, many of whom inevitably rose into the latter class as a result.

---

394. ER, xiii, 649-655.

395. ER, xiii, 654. RMS, ii, 3473-7.

It is noticeable that some of the younger sons of certain noble houses, that is those not destined for a career in the church, were provided with funds to invest in crown feus. For instance, 3½ steads of Fairmanhope in Ettrick forest was granted in feu to George Hepburn, one of the younger sons of the late Patrick, earl of Bothwell, for a farm of £80,[396] while Andrew Hume the 6th son of Alexander, second lord Hume, invested in the feu of the property of Calfcrufband and Corsecleuch whose aggregate annual farm amounted to £30.[397]

However other classes did make inroads into crown feus. A successful career in court circles could facilitate the purchase of a crown feu. John Douglas, employed in the king's wine cellar, for instance, held the feu of the lands of Balbreky in Fife and formed the fourth partner of an unsuccessful bid for the feu of the lands of Kings Barns.[398] Robert Colville of Uchiltree, who held such offices a director of the Chancery, chamberlain of the lordship of Stirlingshire, queen's steward, and writer of the Exchequer Rolls, had accumulated sufficient resources to gain the feu of Tuliculter in Stirlingshire at the rental of £55 and 9 chalders of malt annually.[399] The granting of crown feus to royal officers and employees was a convenient method of paying these persons for their service to the crown or clearing royal debts. On 1 March 1510-11 'for his faithful service in the construction and repair of siege engines and artillery', Robert Borthwick, the king's leading gunner was granted the feu of half the demesne lands of Ballincrieff which James Redheuch had previously occupied for £9 in cash, on 11/3 more than the farm paid by Redheuch, the kind 'reddendo' of 6 chalders, 12 bolls of wheat

---

396. ER, xiii, 650, 655. Paul can give no additional information about this son of earl Patrick. Paul, The Scot's Peerage, ii, 155.

397. ER, xiii, 650. Paul, The Scot's Peerage, iv, 453.

398. ER, xiii, 618, 619, 620. John Douglas had served in that office from at least December 1495, Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, ix, The Account of Comptroller, Duncan Forester, 67.

399. ER, xiii, xll. : x, 1, 240, 256, xiii, 643.

and 1 chalder, 12 bolls of barley remaining the same.[400] Andrew, bishop of Caithness who retained the offices of receiver-general and treasurer towards the end of the reign of James IV, was granted the feu of the steads of Sethope and Douglascrag in Ettrick through the 'gude will and benevolence' of the previous feuar, David Pringle in the Tinnis, 'to dispone tharapon as he plese', for which he submitted an annual farm of £100.[401] Generally, ecclesiastics did not invest in crown leases or feus. However, George, bishop of Dunkeld shared with Alexander Inglis, Archdeacon of St. Andrews, the lease of the lands of Strathbran from June 1490, to July 1494.[402] Being a hereditary tenure from which the maximum profit was extracted only a lengthy retention of the holding, it brought little attraction to ecclesiastics, unless as a vehicle for speculation. It is extremely difficult to discover the extent of burgess investment in crown feus. However, from the names registered in the crown rentals, it would seem that such a trend was limited. Sir Alexander Napier of Merchiston provided one of the most notiable examples of the rise of a family of merchant stock to the ranks of the landed gentry. By means of judicious loans to the crown during the reign of James II, for which the crown was compelled to mortgage portions of royal property, of which Merchiston was never returned to the crown, and a period of loyal, yet profitable service to the crown especially in the office of comptroller, the Napier family moved its basis from the burgh to the countryside.[403] By a

---

400. RMS, ii, 3546
401. ER, xiii, 653.
402. ER, x, 705-6
403. ER, v, 63, 678, 688. In the reign of James II, Alexander Napier, burgess of Edinburgh, was one of the crown's principal creditors. The king in return was forced to mortgage the lands of Merchiston and Auldlindoris and Kinloch, the latter being redeemed. There is ample evidence of other loans to the crown. ER, v, 551, vi, 3. Alexander Napier held positions of prominance in the burgh of Edinburgh. He was both customer and provost of the burgh. ER, vi, 1, 313. He was comptroller from 24 September,1499 to 27 August 1450, from 8 September,1450 to 5 July 1451, from 16 October 1453 to 15 July 1454 from 13 September 1456 to October 1456, and from 19 June 1460 to 7 July 1461. Handbook of British Chronology.

series of shrewd business manoeuvres, the Napier family rose to the position of landed gentry and they made further landed investments through the purchase of the feu of the lands of Auchleische and Auchinlessy in the earldom of Menteith.[404] This swift rise from burgess to gentry must have been exceptional, for, on average, the merchant class of Scotland did not make sufficient profit from trading to afford investment in real estate.

Although the grant of a feu involved the gift of a fief, which would normally be recorded in the Register of the Great Seal, it is significant that, although many feu can be seen in these documents, a substantial number are not. Although royal confirmation under the great seal would have brought greater security to the concession, such royal confirmation undoubtedly cost the feuar a fee. On 4 February 1498-9 the feu charter granted to John Grant of Freuchie of the lordship of Glencairny was recorded in the Register of the Great Seal for which Grant submitted a composition of £266-13-4.[405] On 30 April 1506, 'for the good service performed for James III and IV' and for the payment of a sum of money to the treasurer, James IV annulled the royal action pursued against David Forbes concerning the latter's right to the feu of the lands of Kincraigie and Corse in the barony of O'Neal. In the 1506 account of David, abbot of Dunfermline as treasurer, it was recorded that the composition paid by Forbes for the renewal of his feu grant amounted to £100.[406]

It seems to have been crown policy to restrict the number of names on the feu charter in order to focus responsibility for the payment of the annual farm and the entry fine on as few persons as possible. The fewer the number of immediate tenants the greater was the possibility of the full

---

404. ER, xiii, 635, 636.

405. RMS, ii, 2478. TA, ii, 190. By February 1504-5, £253-6-8 of the total composition had been received by the treasurer, and for the remainder, sir James Ogilvy of Findlater and John Grant were bound.

406. Historical Manuscript Commission, 5th Report, 627. RMS, ii, 2963. TA, iii, 21.

collection of revenue. However, it was not an uncommon policy for the feuar to include his wife or mother in the contract. The lands and mill of Dundurn in Strathearn were feued to John Philipson and his wife, Mary Chisholm in joint infeftment while the lands of Bridland were feued to John Beaton and his mother, Isobel Duddingstone.[407] In order to avoid the payment of a double entry fine on the succession of the heir to the feu, it was common practice for the feu to be associated with the father in liferent and with the son in fee. A quarter part of the mill of Ardate in Fife was feued to James Anderson in liferent and his son, Thomas, in fee.[408] Many feu charters were careful to set down the succession so as to avoid the subdivision of the inheritance. On 4 February 1509-10 the lands of Milton in Strathearn were feued to Luke Bruce and his heirs male, and failing the senior claimant from the female line without division of the holding.[409] This arrangement was included in most of the feu charters in order to ensure against the fragmentation of the feu. In 1511 the feu of Rothulit in Fife was granted to sir Alexander Lindsay of Auchtermonsy in liferent and his son and heir, Alexander in fee and should the latter die childless, the entire feu was to pass to the second son, David.[410] The lands of Fawside in Ettrick were feued to Margaret, widow of the late James Scott, in liferent and the heir of the late John Scott in feu, the identity of which was to be decided by an inquest between David Scott and the offspring of the late John Scott.[411] Many feu charters specifically stated that the father was to enjoy his liferent hold of the property. John Mailville, junior, was granted the fee of an eigth part of the lands of Ardate in Fife on condition that his

---

407. ER, xiii, 646-7.

408. ER, xiii, 623.

409. RMS, ii, 3408.

410. ER, xiii, 624.

411. ER, xiii, 650.

father continued to enjoy his lease to half the holding during his lifetime.[412] There are instances of objections being raised over the settlement of a specific feu. Originally the stead of Soundhope in Ettrick was feued to Gavin Murray for a farm of £24 with the condition that the offspring of Roger Murray and his wife were duly satisfied but the latter objected to the arrangement, with the result that, on 2 May 1511, half the feu was granted to James Murray, the son of the late Roger.[413] In 1510 Ninian Murray received the grant to the feu of the stead of Kershope in Ettrick on condition that he supported his father's offspring.[414] On 31 July 1511 the feu of a quarter and one thirty second part of the lands of Luthrie in Fife was granted to Andrew Kinloch in fee and to his mother in liferent and it was further stated that as long as there was agreement between Kinloch and his mother this simple arrangement was to continue but, in the event of discord between the two parties, Kinloch was to retain the fee of the entire holding and the lifrrent of the feu was to be divided equally between Kinloch and his mother.[415]

Many feu charters insisted that the grantee was to develope his holding. On 4 February 1509-10, the feu of the lands of Uchtertyre and Correglen in Strathearn was granted to Margaret Pitcairn and her son, Patrick Murray and it was recorded that the feuars were to construct and sustain a sufficient mansion of stone and lime, with a hall, chamber, barn, byre, stables, dove-cote garden, orchard, avery, 'le be-hivis', plantations of oak, pools and bridges for easy passage.[416]

---

412. ER, xiii, 623.

413. ER, xiii, 651.

414. ER, xiii, 649. The feu was subsequently split between John Murray, the son of Ninian Murray, who had died, and James Murray ,the son of Peter Murray. ER, xiii, 650.

415. ER, xiii, 623.

416 RMS, ii, 3407.

Concerning feuing, Lythe maintained that 'at the peak of the social pyramid, the great nobles and churchmen and the crown resorted to the feuing of land, not as a means of rural improvement, but because - as Parliament had advised the king - it was 'to the grett proffitt of his croun swa the samin be maid in augmentatioun of his rentale'.[417] Although feuars were encouraged in their charters to develope their holdings and the security of tenure inherent in the feu system provided the incentive which had been lacking under the leasehold, this was merely a side issue to the main purpose, the extraction of greater fiscal returns from property. The aim behind the systematic feuing of royal property under James IV was undoubtedly financial, the almost desperate desire on the part of the crown to eke as much cash as possible from the sources of revenue available to the king in order to sustain the unprecedented expenditure on shipping, building, artillery, a rapidly expanding household and other luxury items which formed a feature of the reign of James IV. Although the sixteenth century price rise meant that the lasting benefit from feuing rested with the feuar and not the crown, it must be noted, in defence of James IV, that, especially during the last five or six years of his reign, James was desperate for ready cash to meet the dramatic increase in royal expenditure in the years before Flodden and also that it is extremely doubtful if James IV's reign witnessed any overall rise in prices.

On the occasion of a portion of property being reassessed for rent it was common practice, the the rentals, to refer to the previous rent level, now termed the 'old extent'. In 1456, the chamberlain of royal property between the Dee and the Spey, was charged with one term's farms from the lordship of Abernethy, which amounted to £10 although it was also mentioned that the lordship, consisting of seven davochs, was valued 'formerly' at 100 marks.[418] The latter figure would have represented the last known rent

---

417. Lythe, The Economy of Scotland, 115. APS, ii, 49, 244.

418. ER, vi, 264.

level of the property. During the fifteenth century thereis little mention of previous rent assessments on account of the reluctance to alter crown rents. The alteration in rent assessments following the introduction of longer leases and feuing during the reign of James IV resurrected the need for the publication of two rent levels, the old and the new. Designations were frequently not given for these valuations and most entries in the rental books merely gave the name of the portion of property, the previous rent, the lessee or feuar, the new level of farm and any other dues to be levied. However, there can be little doubt that the level of rent which had just fallen out of use was commonly referred to as the 'old extent'. On 8 October 1498 Hugh Campbell of Loudoun, sheriff of Ayr, received the 5 year lease of the lands of Barskeoch in Galloway, worth £10 'auld extent' and in future to be let for an annual rent of £20.[419] The mention of the 'old extent' was often included not only to denote the previous rent but also to give some indication of the amount of land leased should the tenant only hold part of a particular portion of land. On 4 February 1508-9 the lands of Dowald in Strathearn were feued to Patrick Murray at a farm of £13-6-8. Included in the entry were the previous rent assessments, that is £5 'de antiquo', the level of rent demanded for the three year lease of the property which was in existance during the fifteenth century, and £10 'de novo', the temporary rent due when the lands were let for 9 years in 1502.[420] In addition, it is clear that during the reign of James IV, there was a body of professional men, of which William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen was undoubtedly one, was engaged in seeking out areas where the royal patrimony had not been fully exploited. They must have noted that the level of rent extracted from a substantial part of royal property had remained relatively static during the major part of the fifteenth century and that there was a rising demand for available land, created by an upward

---

419. RSS, i, 265.

420. ER, xiii, 643.

surge of population beginning in the latter part of the fifteenth century. The situation was ripe for an augmentation in the level of crown rents. The burden of substantial increases in the annual farm demanded from royal tenants was largely offset by the corresponding increase in the security of tenure, either through longer leases or hereditary feus. In this way, the rent derived from the royal demesne came temporarily closer to the true value of the property although the gap was to grow even wider in the second half of the sixteenth century than it had ever been in the fifteenth. Similarly, although the lands of Fordew, Glentarkane and Balmuk were feued to Mary Forrester and John Drummond, William Philipson was reserved a life holding of £2 'old extent' of the lands of Glentarkane, for which he how submitted an annual rent of £5.[421] Again, the 'old extent' refers to the rent charged throughout the fifteenth century. Although terms of reference tended to vary, there seems little doubt that, during the general augmentation of rents which took place during the first decade of the sixteenth century, any mention of 'old extent' referred to the previous 'new extent', that is the rent assessment in operation during the fifteenth century.

Although a large portion of royal property was let to lessees or feuars for a fixed annual rent, there existed other crown estates which were held under different tenures. Throughout the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, certain crown holdings were set in steelbow. Essentially, a holding in steelbow involved the 'cultivation of the estate by free tenants on a tenure'.[422] The tenant was provided with livestock and grain by the king, which remained the property of the crown, and the tenant was bound to cultivate the property. In return for the hire of the king's land and possessions, the tenant was bound to render a fixed annual rent, which tended to be considerably higher than that recorded previously for a simple short lease. On the 28 January 1486-7, the steads of Catslak, East and West Montbernger and Blackgrain, with 800 of the king's sheep were

---

421. ER, xiii, 647.
422. Cochran-Patrick, Medieval Scotland, 6

leased in steelbow to David Crichton for the term of 5 years and he was bound to render to the crown an annual rent of 400 marks.[423] The sanctity of the king's rental is again evident, for, although David was responsible for the payment of the 400 marks at the feast of St.John the Baptist, the accountant of the Ward of Yarrow was still charged with the old rent of £24, 4 'bowky and 8 fog and fule marts', and for the difference the accountant was forced to seek an annual allowance.[424] The cost of provisioning these lands with livestock or grain fell on the crown, for when the steads of Eldanehope, Sithope, Cardonhead and Douglascraig were set in steelbow to John Murray of Fallohill and David Pringle in Tinnis in December 1499, for an annual farm of £200, the lands were to be 'plennyst with 1400 zowis and wedderis, gud and sufficiant schepe of our awne proper gudis', and the cost of these sheep amounted to £336, paid for by Alexander, lord Hume, the chamberlain of the three wards of Ettrick forest.[425] Under the terms of the tenure, the tenants wer entitled to exploit the holding to their own material advantage, the only payment being the rent submitted annually to the crown. Although, on the surface, this type of tenure might seem attractive, its popularity was affected by the introduction of feuing, with the promise of tenurial security, and possibly by the fact that the crown demanded too high a rent.

Under the tenure of steelbow, it was the duty of the tenant to replace the animals which had died during his tenancy. In the actual lease it specified that the tenants were bound to deliver 'the stedis Plennyst with the said schepe als guid as thai ressavit thaim quhen it sal happin thaim to depairt thairfra'.[426] On the 31 June 1510, the Lords of

---

423. ER, ix, 470-1.

424. ER, ix, 471. Also evident was the increase in the rent charged to the steelbow tenure as compared with the figure recorded in the accountant's charge.

425. ER, xi, 205-6. : RSS, i, 435.

426. RSS, i, 435.

the Council decreed that sir Patrick Crichton of Granstone-Ridall, John Murray of Fallohill, David Pringel in the Tinnis, Alexander, lord Hume, William Cranstone of that ilk, Robert Ker and Alexander Tait of Pirn, were to redeliver the sheep which 'war deleverit to the said personis the tyme of the plenising of our soverane lordis lordschip of the forest of Ettrick'. The decree further stated, concerning the 360 sheep which, it was alleged that the laird of Alemore held, that 'the intromettouris therwith salbe callit and summond for the samyn and justice salbe ministrat'.[427] With the king's intention to feu the forest of Ettrick, the steelbow holdings were replaced by holdings in feu. The alteration in the type of holding did not necessarily mean that the family holding the land in question altered, With the feuing of the lands of of East and West Montbernger, Catslak, and Blackgrain, which Patrick Crichton of Cranstone-Riddall had previously held in steelbow for 400 marks, annually these holdings were granted in feu to Crichtons sons, Robert, James, Patrick and William at an annual farm of £281-6-8.[428]

---

427. ADC, 21, f, 194.
Details were given in this decree of the number of sheep each tenant was due to return and also their value, so that the sheep returned were not of inferior quality from those given on the initiation of the tenure.

Sir Patrick Crichton of Cranstone-Riddall	1400 Sheep @ 5/6 each	lands of Catslak, East and West Montbernger and Blackgrain.
John Murray of Fallohill	700 sheep @ 5/6 each	Lands of Eldanehope Sithope, Caddonhead and Douglascraig.
David Pringle of the Tinnis	360 sheep @ 5/6 each	similar land to John Murray of Fallohill.
Alexander, lord Hume	360 sheep @ 5/7 each	
William Cranstone of that ilk.	360 sheep @ 5/6 each	
Robert Ker	360 sheep	ibid.
Alexander Tait of the Pirn.	360 sheep	ibid.

428. See Appendix No.B/3(f) Ettrick Section.

At the termination of the tenure, the king was faced with the problem of either retrieving or disposing of his possessions. The sons of Patrick Crichton of Cranstone-Ridall, now feuars of the lands of East and West Mountbernger, Blackgrain and Catslak, promised to deliver the king's sheep to the comptroller.[429] On 8 September 1507 Andrew, bishop of Moray was granted the tack of the mains of Dunbar for 19 years and a day later, a royal letter directed the comptroller and treasurer to sell 'all and hale his gudis, victulis and uthir gere being apon his ground and Manys Dunbar' to the bishop who formerly held the property in steelbow. The goods consisted of 15 chalders, 2 firlots, 2 pecks of wheat, 7 chalders, 7 bolls, 2 firlots of bere, 21 chalders, 8 bolls, 1 firlot of oats, 2 chalders, 14 bolls, 1 firlot of peas, 86 oxen, 487 'zowis', 217 lambs and 3 'wanys' which were sold to the bishop 'to the Kingis maist utilite and proffit and ressavit in redy money theirfor, as thare acquitance gevin thairapon proportis'.[430]

However steelbow was not confined to Ettrick forest. Throughout the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the king frequently let a small part of his porperty in steelbow, lands ranging from the Mains of Darnaway in the north, to Lupnock and Lossintrule in the barony of Skeauch, to the grange of Baldune in Galloway.[431] Probably one of the best documented steelbow leases was the grange of Darnaway, leased to Robert Rankin vicar of Inverness.[432] On the 24 March 1504-5 there is recorded an inventory of the oats, barley, oxen, cows and sheep which were to be found on the grange. The oats were divided into stacks and various persons, namely the ploughmen, Walter Douglas, who 'kept the place', the smith, and John Ayr, watchman, were given their expenses in oats, while the shepherd

---

429. ER, xiii, 654.

430. RSS, i, 1529, 1534.

431. ER, xii, 490, 638, 656, 672.

432. ER, xii, 288, 490. RSS, i, 1380.

and John McGillemoyll supervised most of the livestock.[433] For the lease of the grange of Baldune, Joan Stewart, widow of John Dunbar of Mochrum, was stated to have possession of 16 of the king's bullocks, 8 chalders of oats and £16 for the upkeep of the grange, and in return for the lease, she was to pay 9 chalders of oatmeal annually.[434] In 1508, the lands of Urquhart in Fife were leased to George Moncrieff and his son, Robert for a rent of 20 marks with the additional condition that he was to permit the pasturing of 500 of the king's sheep, at his own expense, on his holding.[435] Earlier in the fifteenth century, crown property which was occupied by the king's own goods were managed on his behalf by the comptroller or his subordinates. The expenses incurred by these granges were normally paid for out of the accounts of the local Ballivi ad Extra, who also obtained and allowance for the farms of these lands in his account.[436] In 1438 the chamberlain of the earldom of Mar was allowed a considerable sum of money for the expenses of the granges of Migvy, Kildrummy, Feithly, Drumlochy and Durnoschelis, £42-5-6 for the general expenses of the granges for 1436, £8 for the annual fees of four grangers for the same year, 6/- for the purchase of 6 wooden ploughs for the grange of Feichly and other epxenses concerning the custody and the driving of cattle and wild horses.[437] The purchase of livestock and grain for these granges was also the responsibility of the accountant, for, the chamberlain of Fife in 1456 was allowed £19-13-5 for the purchase of 5 chalders, 14 bolls, 1 firlot and 3 pecks of oats, delivered to Master Thomas Esok for sowing in the grange of Methven,[438] and the chamberlain of Menteith and Strathearn in 1458 was allowed £17-1/- for

---

433. ER, xii, 672-3. See Appendix No. B/3(m)

434. ER, xii, 656.

435. ER, xiii, 614.

436. ER, v, 59, vi, 241, 409.

437. ER, vi, 59-60.

438. ER, vi, 253.

the purchase of 14 bullocks for the same grange.[439] In the 1456 account of Galloway, the accountant was to pay for the expenses of 'eight servants called hynys, threshers, winnowers and the expenses of servants and horses at the time of the harvesting of the said granges'.[440] This particular account also gives evidence of estate mismanagement, The chamberlain was given allowance for the purchase of 5 bolls of oats for sowing in the grange of Threave, yet, it is stated, that the grain did not come to the king's use, 'et male'.[441]

---

439. ER, vi, 425.

440. ER, vi, 206.

441. ER, vi, 206.

THE BURGH ACCOUNTS

Knowledge of the developments within these accounts is greatly enhanced by the high survival rate of the accounts of the burgh baillies during the late Medieval period.[1] In common with the customers' accounts, during the fifteenth century the burgh accounts are almost complete, with only a few omissions during the reign of James I and only three further gaps from 1437 to 1513.[2] Of all the accounts recorded in the Exchequer Rolls, those of the burgh baillies were undoubtedly the most conservative in form. For long periods in the fifteenth century, the burgh accounts retained a static appearance, with many charges and discharges being repeated annually in exactly the same form. The acceptance of the feufarm tenure by the royal burghs encouraged further the staid appearance of the accounts. For several burghs, their entries in the Exchequer Rolls were the essence in simplicity, containing only information concerning the fixed feu levy, the regular, and often long standing, pension payments, and the amount, if any, payable to the crown. Even the latter was frequently static in amount, for the burgh of Montrose paid £1-2-8 annually from 1405 to 1513.[3]

During the fourteenth century, the burgh accounts had undergone considerable change. In the first half of the fourteenth century, burgh accounts were rendered by 'prepositi' who tended to make separate entries for farms, court fines, and small customs.[4] However, during the disruption

---

1. Burgh baillies accounted to the king for the accounts of the royal burghs. They were chosen from among the burgess community.

2. For the reign of James I, missing accounts included 1426-7, 1431-2, 1432-3 and 1435-6. But from 1437 until 1513,only in 1438-9, 1469-70 and 1471-2 have the accounts of burghs failed to survive.

3. ER, iv, 32, xiii, 582.

4. Pryde, Ayr Burgh Accounts, Scot. Hist. Soc., xvi. These presented the farms payable from all burgh holdings and tenements and the issues of the burgh court. The small or petty customs represented a duty payable on nearly all articles brought to the burgh market and included harbour dues on all ships docking at the burgh.

of David II's reign, burgh accounts became increasingly irregular and the sums rendered fell dramatically. In the 1341 account of the 'prepositus' of Dundee, the accountant complained that nothing was rendered for the period from the term of Whitsun 1336 until the three terms before the day of the present account as the cash had fallen into hostile hands.[5] Dundee, like many other burghs in this period recorded a considerable decline in the gross annual burgh farm, for, during the 1320s and 1330s, the figure averaged around £20 annually, but as the reign of David II progressed, the figure descended sharply to between £3 and £6-13-4.[6] But, around 1360, with the recovery of prosperity and a greater tendency for the regular payment of burgh farms, many burghs found it advantageous to accept crown leases for a specific period of time and later crown feus, granted in perpetuity. This movement was beneficial to both the burghs and the crown, but, in the long term the former achieved the better bargain.

By a charter of feufarm the 'burgh' was held by the 'community' in free burgage in perpetuity.[7] Previously each burgess held his toft or tenement of the king through a separate title, but with the acceptance of the feu holding, burgesses were now required to pay a fixed rent as an entire group or 'community'.[8] By this means, the burgh gained control

---

5. ER, i, 473.

6. ER, i, ii.

Year	Gross Charge
1327	£22
1328	£9 (only for 1 term)
1329	£19
1330	£21
1331	£11 (only for 1 term)
1332	£22
1341	£8-17-10 (for three terms)
1342	£6-13-4. Lease of the chamberlain.
1343	£6 and £6-13-4 for the first and second terms.

7. Dickinson. The Early Records of Aberdeen, Scot. Hist. Soc., lxxv.

8. Originally the 'toft' was the plot of land and the 'tenement' the building erected on the land, but later both terms came to include both items.

over its finances, for, apart from the fixed annual feufarm due to the crown, the burgh was free to dispose of its own income according to its discretion. Since the majority of the burghs drew their revenues from land rents, burgh court fines and unlaws, petty customs, the leasing of burgh mills and fishing rights, the amount paid annually by the burgh community to the crown must have represented only a small proportion of the cash income of the burgh.[9] This feature became increasingly obvious during the fifteenth century for although the feufarm remained static, the burgh community was not only expanding in property and rights, but also acquiring greater profit from its existing possessions. Although, by the terms of the feu charter, the crown received £34-13-4 annually from the burgh of Edinburgh, in 1482, the burgh mills, petty customs, haven silver and "wild aventouris' were leased for the year for a return of 1,940 marks.[10] The gap between the fixed feufarm and the burgh farms actually collected by the baillies of the burgh only began to slowly draw apart in the early fifteenth century. Because the feufarm of Aberdeen was established in the early fourteenth century, during the relatively prosperous latter years of Robert I, it was, at £213-6-8 annually, set at a higher rate than the burgh feus settled later in that century when an economic recession had set in. In the account of the baillies of the burgh of Aberdeen on 29 August 1407, the gross receipt from the burgh farms amounted to £238-9s, only £25 beyond the feufarm, but, in the 1436 account of John Scroggis, provost of the burgh, the gross farm

---

9. Pryde, Ayr Burgh Records, xxix-liv, for details of burgh sources of revenue.

10. Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1, 41-2.

Details of the arrangements: Tacks of mills and rents on 10 November 1482. The mills leased for the next year to John Whitehead for 480 marks. The petty customs leased to sir John Murray of Tulchad for 140 marks. The petty customs and haven silver leased to Adam Halkerstone, treasurer for 110 marks. 'The Wild Aventouris' leased to the treasurer, Adam Halkerstone, for 1,210 marks. The wild aventures represented the dues levied on commercial undertakings of a hazardous nature.

from landed property, fishing and mills totalled £453-8-8 for the year. Thus, in thirty years, the revenue extracted by the burgh from its property had almost doubled and the surplus available to the burgh following the payment of the feufarm to the crown amounted to £240.[11] Not such an extreme example was provided by the burgh of Lanark. During the second half of the fourteenth century, the annual burgh farm was suffering a steady decline, in 1366 the farm was £13-6-8, by 1380 it was leased for an annual farm of £10 and between 1383 and 1392 the lease was only valued at 10 marks.[12] Probably in a bid to halt the decline in returns from Lanark, the crown granted the burgh a feu charter, with a fixed annual farm of £6.[13] Unfortunately the measure was only of short term advantage to the crown, for as the burgh expanded and prospered during the fifteenth century, the crown lost out as the feufarm remained static. In 1503 and 1507, the year's rental as charged to the rentmaster of the burgh stood at £33-19-3 and £37-15-4 respectively. Whereas the feufarm payable to the king remained at £6 annually.[14] The surplus remaining after the payment of the crown feu, which must have been considerable in the larger burghs where the feu payments were relatively small, was, by act of Parliament, to contribute towards the burgh 'Common Good'.[15] In theory, this fund financed the common works and affairs of the burgh, but seems to have been frequently misappropriated. Instead of being administered directly by the burgh, the 'Common Good' was commonly leased out for private use.

---

11. The Early Records of Aberdeen, Scottish History Society, xlix, 239. Miscellany of the Spaulding Club, v, 46.

12. ER, iii, 20, 59, 72, 101, 130, 139, 160, 181, 198, 214, 232, 263, 304. Extracts from the Records of the Royal Burgh of Lanark, 347.

13. ER, iii, 332.

14. ER, xii, 605. Extracts from the Records of the Royal Burgh of Lanark, 12, 16. The 1507 rental (lot of rentallers and size of holding, see PP 15-16, included £3 'of burgh silver'.

15. APS, ii, 252.

Supervision of the fate of the 'Common Good' tended to be extremely lax, and the fund was frequently misappropriated.[16] By its very nature, the feufarm remained static, and, as a result, when the burgh revenues increased and as new burgages were formed, the resulting augmentation went to the burgh community and not to the crown. In common with the feu arrangements on crown estates, the returns were being constantly affected by the steady debasement of the currency and the later rise in prices. In the long term, the effective contribution of the burgh feu returns to the crown diminished in value, until, by the end of the sixteenth century, the crown began to demand payments in sterling or made attempts to increase the feu duty itself to relieve the loss.[17]

As the burgh magistrates had been responsible for the collection of the burgh farms since the twelfth century, the feufarm made little difference to the collection of the revenue. The fixed annual levy eased the administrative problems of the royal financial officials at the centre. Instead of separate returns for burgh farms, court issues, mills and fishing, the feufarm tended to include the various items under one return. In common with other crown charters, the feu charter to a burgh required the payment of a composition on the occasion of it being granted or confirmed. Such payments for new infeftments were recorded in the treasurers' accounts. In the 1507 account of David Beaton, the communities of Peebles, Kintore, and Ayr were bound to pay £133-6-8, £16-13-4 and £500 respectively for the confirmation of their charters.[18] The fixed return of the feu duty proved to be a mixed blessing. In the fourteenth century, the fixture of the burgh return avoided the worst effects of fluctuating returns, which, as already mentioned, were common during the reign of David II. Yet, the

---

16. Pryde, Ayr Burgh Accounts, Scottish History Society, xx-xxii.

17. Pryde, Ayr Burgh Records, xviii.

18. TA, iii, 225, 236, 237.

longer the fixed return remained, the increasingly disadvantageous it became to the crown with coin and price alterations. In the landed estates of the crown, the change to feu holding stimulated an upward trend in the crown returns from the areas affected, but, with the feuing of the burgh farms, the augmentation in the revenue returned to the crown proved to be only slight.

During the reigns of Robert II and III, the majority of the principal burghs of Scotland accepted the change to feu holding. By the death of James I, almost all the burghs whose accounts appeared in the Exchequer accounts had attained feu status. Throughout the course of the fifteenth century, as each new burgh entered the rolls of the burgh baillies, if it had not already acquired a feu charter, the tendency was that it would do so. The process, however, was not always of short duration, for the burgh of Selkirk first appeared in the Exchequer Rolls in 1428, but it was not until 1501 that the burgh achieved feu status.[19] However, of the eighteen selected burghs, of which only two had accepted the feu status by 1360 and only two had not by 1400, the gross annual return to the crown between 1360 and 1400 advanced only slightly. In the 1360s the gross annual charge of these burghs amounted to £456-13-4, and by the 1400s the total had risen only to £567.[20] When the individual history of each burgh is studied, it becomes obvious that the conversion to feu tenure affected the crown's returns in differing ways. To several burgh baillies, the change to the feu holding meant an augmentation in the gross charge payable to the crown. However, the amount of the increase varied considerably. Between 1360 and 1373, the gross burgh farms of Perth fluctuated between £26 and £54 but in

---

19. ER, iv, 460, xi, 383.

20. See Appendix No.B/4(a)

1376, the feu duty was fixed at an annual return of £80.[21] Although Perth represented a substantial increase in the gross charge, other alterations were of more modest size. The burghs of Inverness, Banff and Dundee, paid annual farms of £40, £30-6-8 and £13-6-8 respectively, and the conversion to feu holding demanded increases of 20 marks, 5 marks and 10 marks to the above duties.[22] In several burghs during the transformation from the lease to the feu, the crown appears to have settled for only a nominal increase or, for a figure less than what had been paid in preceding years. In the decades before 1393, the returns from the burgh of Lanark declined dramatically, from £16-13-6 in 1370, to £10 in 1380 and £6-13-4 in 1390, and when the burgh farms were feued in 1393, the gross levy was fixed at only £6.[23] Although the burgh farm of Forfar was feued in 1393, the 'reddendo' at £8-13-4 remained the same as it had done under the chamberlain's lease.[24] During the fifteenth century, the burghs which still retained a short lease tenure were gradually converted to the feu holding. A feature of these later conversions was that they involved little or no alteration in the gross revenue due to the crown. In 1451 Dumbarton was leased by the chamberlain for an annual return of £8, but after that date the tenure was transformed into a feu holding with no further addition to the rental.[25]

---

21. ER, ii. Feu holding, ER, ii, 540.
Figures for the gross returns of Perth:-

1360	£40
1361	£46-13-4
1362	£49
1364	£35-4-8
1365	£50
1366	£51
1367	£52
1369	£54
1372	£26
1373	£27
1376	£80. Now leased in feufarm.

22. ER, ii, iii. Appendix No.B/4(a)

23. Appendix No.B/4(a) ER, iii, 333.

24. ER, iii, 308, 335.

25. ER, v, 442, 562. During the fourteenth century, the gross revenue extracted from the burgh fluctuated until the 1400s, when a lease, valued at £8 was settled. Appendix No.B/4(a)

On the settlement of the extent of the feu tenure, by its very nature, the amount payable tended on average to remain static, but, although the feufarm of the burgh of Dumfries was settled at the annual payment of £20 in 1395, in the 1429-30 burgh account the rate appears to have been raised by 1s, at which level it remained.[26] In the fifteenth century there was some readjustment in assessments. A seven year account of the burgh forms of Renfrew, from 1436 to 1443, recorded a total receipts of £37-6-8. By the following account of 1444, the burgh farm has been feued to the community for annual return to the crown of £10-6-8, but in the light of previous receipts, the feufarm had been set too high and sometime between November 1452 and June 1453, it was reduced to £5-6-8 annually.[27]

Throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, new burghs appears in the rolls of the burgh baillies at periodic intervals. For some, it was merely an administrative alteration, for the burgh of Rothesay, charged at £6 through crown feufarm, made its first appearance in these accounts, in 1507, although the burgh had previously been the responsibility of the chamberlain of Bute.[28] In the same year, the burgh of Nairn made its first recorded entry in the burgh accounts, charged at £10 annual feufarm, but previously the farms had been granted to Elizabeth, countess of Ross, for her lifetime.[29] However, other burghs did not enter the Exchequer accounts already equipped with a feu charter. The process of settlement of burgh farms, common in the fourteenth century, was still in operation during the fifteenth. For the period 1428 to 1467, the burgh account of Selkirk comprised of three separate items, firstly £2-6-8 for the farms of

---

26. ER, iii, 446, iv, 518. There is no explanation given for the addition to the feufarm.

27. ER, v, 138, 158-9, 563.

28. ER, xii, 607.

29. ER, xii, 606.

110 roods of land belonging to the burgh (at the old assessment of 5d for each rood), secondly the petty customs, and thirdly 6-8d. from certain portions of land, forfeited into the hands of the king.[30] Just after the 1473 account, it was declared that the total revenue, valued in that year at 5 marks annually, would be leased to John Cranstone for the period of 5 years for an annual levy of £5.[31] After the expiry of the lease, the Cranstone family seems to have retained control of the burgh farms (at the king's tolerance) 'ex tollerancia domini regis' until 1498, when the burgh was granted a feu holding at the same rate of annual rent as before.[32] Selkirk provided a useful example of the various stages of development of a burgh account in the fifteenth century and the manner in which the annual levy was affected by each stage. In contrast to the consistent development of Selkirk, North Berwick, which first appeared in the accounts in 1426, suffered a more turbulent passage. Although under the chamberlain's lease from the outset, during the fifteenth century, the burgh also received leases from sir Robert Lauder of Bass in 1426, and the Auditors of the Exchequer in 1446.[33] The annual charge appeared to fluctuate considerably from 10s to £1-8s; the former return accompanied by a 'memorandum' stating that no more revenue could be extracted through wastage, and it was only after 1454 that the charge settled down to £1

---

30. ER, iv, 551.

31. ER, viii, 206.

32. ER, x, 395, xi, 383. Jedburgh suffered a similar fate as Selkirk and was also associated with the Cranstones.

33. ER, iv, 418, v, 243.

annually.[34] In 1467, the burgh of North Berwick was granted a feu charter which fixed the annual levy at £1.[35] The steady decline in the importance of the office of chamberlain during the fifteenth century affected the manner in which burgh accounts were administered. In the course of the century, the employment of a lease as a preliminary to the feufarm tended to disappear and in its place burgh farms were made payable 'by royal tolerance'.[36] In March 1320, Robert I granted a charter of feu status to the burgh of Berwick for an annual return to the crown of 500 marks.[37] However, when the burgh was held by the king of Scotland between 1461 and 1481, the feu status appears to have been lost. Until 27 April 1476, the great and small customs, fishings, burgh farms, and other dutes payable to the king from the burgh, had been assigned en bloc to the keepers of Berwick castle, but from 1477, Berwick accounts were entered in the Exchequer Rolls.[38] Although not now held in feufarm, the burgh returns for Berwick were still of considerable extent. The burgh mails of Berwick had been leased to certain burgess by the royal commissioners for an annual rental of £92-13-2.

---

34. Details of the North Berwick burgh returns during the fifteenth century:-

1426	£1-6-8.	Lease of sir Robert Lauder of Bass.
1429	£1	Lease of the chamberlain.
1430	£1-6-8.	Ibid.
1434	£1-8s.	Ibid.
1444	£4	Total for 8 years, and nothing more through wastage.
1445	13s.	Total for 1 year, and nothing more through wastage.
1446	15s.	Lease of the Auditors of the Exchequer.
1447	16s.	Lease of the chamberlain.
1449	£1	Ibid.
1451	18s.	Ibid.
1455	£1	Ibid.

In 1467, the burgh farms were feued to the burgh community at the rate of £1 annually to the king.

35. ER, vii, 667.

36. ER, x, 615, xi, 133.

37. Percy Chartulary, Surtees Society, 537-440.

38. ER, viii, 388, 551.

This figure, along with the annual returns from fishing, ferry services, the land rent of Sumwick, and small customs, amounted to a gross charge of £115-19-10 and 6 lasts of salmon in 1481.[39] The reason for the reversal of the normal trend is obscure, but, with the decline of the burgh of Berwick from its peak as the main Scottish commercial entrepot in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, it is probable that the burgh was unable to pay the full feufarm of 500 marks.[40] From the 1330s to the mid 1360s, the gross annual burgh farm payable to the crown tended to fluctuate violently. But with the establishment of more predictable returns in the later fourteenth century, the tendency towards leasing and later feuing the burgh farms was accelerated.

Although the movement was fairly universal, the financial results for the crown were far from regular. There existed a very wide range within the feu assessments, from £213-6-8 paid annually by Aberdeen to a mere £1 payable from the burgh of North Berwick. However, the various feu assessments do not appear to have had any obvious basis of calculation. When compared to the tax assessment of the burghs for the king's ransom, rendered in 1435-6, it soon becomes obvious that there existed large discrepancies in several cases. In comparing the positions of the various burghs in both the tax assessment and the feu returns, the most striking

---

39. ER, viii, 551, 633, ix, 81, 157.
Details: 1478

Burgh farm, leased	£92-13-2
Small customs	£5
Farms of the land of Sunwick	£5 (Sunwick is 6 miles west of the burgh)
Returns of the Ferry of the Tweed	£2 In 1481 it rose to £3-6-8
Fishing of the Tweed	6 lasts of Salmon.

From 1480, the fishing of Auldstell and Crabwater levied at £10 annually, leased to Robert Inglis.

40. The annual feufarm of Berwick from 1320 was levied at 500 marks annually, but the total derived from the burgh farms and other dues in 1481, amounted to around £270 (the result of commuting the salmon return at the rate of £156 for every 6 lasts of salmon, see ER, viii, 634).

variation occurred in the case of Edinburgh, for in the former list, it was almost double the assessment of the two burghs lying second, yet in the latter list, Edinburgh lay only fourth, valued at only a sixth of the top burgh, Aberdeen.[41] There are other burghs whose feu returns were far removed from that of their tax assessment, for Banff, Ayr and Inverness feufarms occupied a lofty position while Linlithgow and Lanark paid feufarms lower than might be anticipated in the tax rolls. Although the wealth of the burgh at the time of the feu grant must have been a large consideration, for Aberdeen, £213-6-8, and Perth, £80, were undoubtedly amongst the more affluent of the royal burghs in Scotland, that explanation could not the low feufarm position of Edinburgh, £34-13-4, Linlithgow, £5, and Dundee, £20. Both Aberdeen and Dundee were assessed at the same rate for the ransom of James I, but there existed a large gulf between their feufarms. It is significant that the two largest feu assessments, Berwick, £333-6-8, and Aberdeen, £213-6-8, were also the earliest, being granted in 1320 and 1319 respectively.[42] It seems likely that timing was a contributary factor in assessing the extent of the feu settlement. Berwick and Aberdeen, the burghs with the highest feufarm assessments, achieved their new status during the reign of Robert I and was undoubtedly based on current burgh farm returns. The former was still a considerable trading centre and was, at that juncture, still the principal burgh in Scotland, while Aberdeen was one of the wealthiest if the customs figures are any guide. In 1229, just after the death of Robert I, Edinburgh gained feufarm status with an annual return of £34-13-4. However, during the fourteenth century the removal of Berwick as the chief trading centre resulted in the shift of a large portion of commercial interest

---

41. See Appendix, No.B/4(d)

42. Percy Chartulary, Surtees Society, 437-40. APS, i, 478. ER, i, 400. Berwick feufarm assessed at 500 marks as in the time of Alexander III.

to Edinburgh which grew rapidly in wealth and status. Although Edinburgh had outstripped all other Scottish burghs by 1400, the feufarm payable to the crown remained the same. The royal burghs which achieved feufarm tenure during the period 1360 to 1400 would obviously have been affected by the disruption of the reign of David II and the relative stagnance of the early Stewarts, since, as shown above, the feufarm was more or less related to the current burgh farm assessment. Thus, Dundee, which had been paying a farm of 20 marks in the few years prior to feuing was finally set to feu in 136 at an annual farm to the crown of £20.[43] This is probably the explanation for the large discrepancy between the feufarm assessment of Dundee and Aberdeen. The explanation for the high feu assessment for the burghs of Inverness, 80 marks, and Banff, 50 marks - the former paid £18-13-4 more annually than the burgh of Edinburgh - can only be a matter of conjecture. The answer is probably connected with the individual negotiations conducted by each burgh with the king, with both parties striving to achieve the most advantageous terms. The late conversion to feu status of Selkirk, 1498, Jedburgh, 1496, Lauder, 1502, and other small burghs was probably one of economics for, unlike the larger burghs, they were less able to afford the composition for the feu charter.[44] In addition to royal burghs, the feufarm tenure was also in evidence in burghs of regality in the fifteenth century. On 20 January 1450-1 the burgh farms of Kirkcaldy were set in feu by the abbot of Dunfermline for an annual 'reddendo' of £1-13-4, and, on 18 August 1466, a similar grant was received by the community of Musselburgh where the annual feufarm was settled at 4 marks.[45]

---

43. See Appendix No.B/4(a)

44. ER, xi, 383, 384, xii, 273.

45. Registrum de Dunfermelyn, 318-9, 357-8.

Throughout the fifteenth century, the gross annual returns from the accounts of the burgh baillies assumed an air of inevitability. The rigidity of the feu 'reddendo' was the principal cause of this situation. In the fifteenth century, increases in the charge came mainly from two sources. First, there was a rise in the numbers of burghs which accounted in the rolls. During the five years from 1415 to 1420, only an annual average of eleven burghs accounted to the exchequer, but, during the reigns of James II and III the number appears to have doubled. In the latter part of the reign of James IV, an average of 30 burghs rendered accounts annually, with a record 32 being achieved at the audit of 1507.[46] The cause of such a rise was partly achieved by the actual increase in the numbers of royal burghs accounting, but also by the tendency of burghs to account more regularly. Towards the latter half of the reign of James IV, crown policy of attempting to force royal burghs to account more regularly was meeting with considerable success. In previous reigns, the high financial cost of regular accounting discouraged many of the peripheral burghs from participating. Between 1465 and 1496, the burgh of Inverness accounted on only ten occasions, with some of the accounts stretching for four or six years, but, for the remainder of James IV's reign, the burgh failed to account on only one occasion.[47] In 1467, the burgh of Selkirk accounted for

---

46. Average annual appearance of the burgh baillies at the Exchequer.

1415-20	11.
1455-60	20.
1480-5	18.
1505-10	30.

47. Inverness Accounts:-

1466	1 year
1467	1 year
1476	4 years
1482	6 years
1483	1 year
1486	3 years
1489	3½ years
1492	3 years
1494	1½ years
1496	2 years

But after 1496, the burgh baillies accounted every year, except 1502.

the first time for 33 years and out of a total gross charge of £110, only £2-13-4 was paid over to the comptroller.[48] There is little doubt that the crown lost heavily from irregular accounting. Certainly royal policy of clamping down on financial mal-administration was effective, for between 1466 and 1476, only 4 out of a total of 30 burghs accounting for every single year, while during the decade 1503 to 1513, 20 out of 36 burghs submitted regular annual accounts.[49] In theory, the burgh was liable to a £10 fine for every year that the baillies failed to account at the exchequer. In 1406-7, the baillies of Ayr were fined £140 for their absence for the previous fourteen years. However, frequently the fines were remitted, as in the above case, where the remission contained the condition that the burgh was to conduct masses for the souls of the kings of Scotland, the duke of Rothesay and others.[50] Although full payment of the fine by the burgh was not common, the amount remitted tended to vary. In 1487 the burgh of Haddington gained remission for half the fine, the remainder being spent by the auditors on drink,[51] while in 1501, the burghs of Inverkeithing and Haddington paid only £2 of the total £10.[52] To avoid the cost of the baillies personal attendance at the Exchequer and the risk of incurring a £10 fine for non-appearance, many of the burghs either sent one of their baillies to account or else employed an outsider, already resident at the court, to perform the task. James II, III, and especially James IV, made definite attempts to augment the number of burgh accounting for their annual

---

48. ER, vii, 516.

49. The total numbers of burghs represented all the burghs which had accounted sometime within the 10 year span.

50. ER, iv, 22-23.

51. ER, ix, 550.

52. ER, xi, 381, 382.

payments at the Exchequer. Among the burghs which made their first appearance in the rolls under James II were Wigtown and Kirkcudbright, 1458, which had been burghs of regality under the sway of the earls of Douglas, and on the latter's forfeiture, were created royal burghs on 26 October 1455.[53] There seems to have been attempts to encourage the burghs of Dunbar, in 1457, the Elgin and Forres, in 1467, to render their accounts in the burgh rolls, but the ventures failed,[54] and the burghs never made any reappearance. Under James IV, several royal burghs made their debut in the accounts, Lauder in 1494, Cullen in 1496, Kintore in 1506, Nairn and Rothesay in 1507.[55] Although the actual cash involved in exploiting burgh revenues was extremely small, nevertheless, the crown was anxious to extract the maximum from this source. Although the accounts of the burgh farms of Lauder and Cullen first appeared in the burgh baillie accounts in 1494 and 1496 respectively, they had originally fallen within the scope of the accounts of the sheriffs of Berwick and Banff.[56] In 1501 the steward of Annandale accounted for the burgh farms of Lochmaben at 28s for the year, but he was ordered to inquire into the exact value of the farms and to cease accounting for them in the future as the burgh baillies were ordered to appear at the Exchequer on their own account.[57] Although the burgh baillies of Lochmaben appear to have accounted in 1507, the inquest into the value of the farms was still in progress and the baillie's appearance was not repeated during the rest of the reign of James IV.[58] The property rolls also included some burgh

---

53. ER, vi, 405-6.

54. ER, v, 315, vii, 517. Between the Douglas forfeiture and the 1457 account the chamberlain of Galloway accounted for the returns of both these burghs.

55. ER, xi, 468, 620, xii, 478, 606, 607.

56. ER, x, 468. Sheriff's accounts 1489. ER, x, 620.

57. ER, xi, 340.

58. ER, xii, 607.

accounts. The burghs of Dingwall and Falkland continued throughout the late Medieval period to be recorded in the rolls of the chamberlains of Ross and Fife respectively.[59] The burgh accounts of Forres and Elgin made an isolated appearance in the burgh rolls in 1467, accounted by James Douglas, procurator for the burgh baillies, but thereafter the chamberlain of Moray included them in his account.[60] The attempt at transferring various burgh accounts to the burgh rolls met with mixed results. Secondly, at periodic intervals, additional items were charged to the burgh baillies. In the mid fifteenth century, it appears that, for a short period, the burgh baillies became temporarily responsible for collecting the issues of the chamberlain ayres, previously charged to the sheriff. The amount of actual cash involved varied considerably from year to year, for in the five accounts rendered between 1466 and 1471, the gross charge from this source amounted to £36, £2, £92, £27-13-4 and £81-3-4 respectively.[61] A considerable portion of these sums were assigned to the chamberlain for his fee. After the deduction of ecclesiastical teinds, the remainder of the charge from the ayres was paid into the central government, through either the comptroller, Treasurer, or the Keeper of the Privy Seal. Frequently the baillie avoided responsibility for the issues of the chamberlain ayre by claiming that he had not yet received the extract,[62] often resulting in an inquiry, or by asserting that the chamberlain had received the issues himself.[63] In 1486 the baillie of Edinburgh was not charged with the issues of the ayre, held within the burgh by John Wilson, chamberlain inside the sheriffdom of Edinburgh and the constabulary of Haddington, as James III had conceded the entire profits of the

---

59. ER, viii, 595. Dingwall, at £5 annual burgh farm, leased to the burgesses ER, vi, 610, x, 494, xvi, 493, RMS, ii, 706-28. Burgh farms were feued on 6 July 1459 by James II for £20 annual farm and the maintenance of men and horses in ledging and stables.

60. ER, vii, 517, viii, 521.

61. ER, vii, 433-9, 512-8, 593-7, 666-72, viii, 102-116.

62. ER, iv, 492, 493

63. ER, iv, 456.

office of chamberlain to John for the duration of his life.[64] Others items charged to the burgh baillies tended to be of a temporary nature. They included fines for non-appearance at the Exchequer on the appointed date,[65] the rent of lands in the king's hands, either through non-entry,[66] escheat[67] or recognition,[68] the sale of wool and other goods from persons convicted of crimes against the privileges of the royal burgh,[69] and occasionally great customs.[70] The majority of these items were of little value. In 1490, 1491 and 1493 the baillies of Edinburgh were charged with the issues of the justice ayre held inside the burgh, totalling £75, £97 and £112 respectively.[71] From 1472 the baillies of Inverness were ordered to account for the annual farms of the lands of Ballochill which had been leased by the king to the burgh at £4 annually.[72] A chart of the burgh revenues revealed not only the intense conservatism surrounding these accounts, but also the large indentations made by ecclesiastical and lay pensions into the gross charge. It is possible to assess the burgh returns for almost the entire fifteenth century since the amounts concerned varied only slightly. Taking the average annual returns of the separate burghs for the years 1457-60 and 1507-10, it soon becomes obvious that, although all the totals rose between the two dates, the rise was only slight and the individual items all increased

---

64. ER, viii, 515.

65. ER, vii, 372, 375.

66. ER, viii, 474.

67. ER, ix, 458.

68. ER, viii, 265, 324. Usually at £10.

69. ER, xiii, 107. 1508 burgh account of Montrose, the baillie charged with the sale of 17½ stone of wool at £8-15s, and 5 hides at £1-10s, which had belonged to John Tailor and Thomas Crum, who lived in the Mearns, and who had exported them out of the burgh against the tenor of the king's letters, and as a result, their goods were forfeit to the crown.

70. ER, viii, 263.

71. ER, x, 243, 366, 396.

72. ER, viii, 399, ix, 206.

in roughly the same proportion. Between the two dates, the gross annual charge rose from £655-11s to £705-1s annually. Although, on the surface, these totals were small enough, compared with the issues from other crown sources, in fact, the amount was considerably smaller after the deduction of various annual pensions. Lay and ecclesiastical fees and pensions amounted to £514-19s in 1457-60, and rose to £565-7s annually in 1507-10, representing a loss to the crown of around 80%. Ecclesiastical pensions contributed the larger amount, £314-19s annually at the earlier date, and £339-18-4 annually at the later date.[73] The principal benefactors were local monestaries of various demoninations, priories, church dignatories like the bishop of Aberdeen ad the abbot of Dunfermline, nunneies, hospitals controlled by churchmen, and chaplains, whose fees were normally payable in returns for the performance of specific divine services for the dead. The majority of these concessions were gifted by the crown before the fifteenth century and the crown was pwerless to halt this continual drain on his resources. Since most of these grants were in mortmain, they were irrevocable.[74] Throughout the fourteenth century, the crown seems to have made generous endowments to the church, Robert I granted to the Dominican Friars of Ayr an annual pension of £20 from the local burgh farms,[75] while the same monarch also granted to the Dean and Cathedral of Caithness an annuity of 5 marks from the burgh mails of Aberdeen, for the purchase of one cask of wine and one chalder of wheat for the celebration of communion.[76] Many other ecclesiastical concessions which appeared in the burgh accounts in the fifteenth century, originated from the reigns of Robert II and III. The Dean of the Cathedral of Aberdeen was granted an annuity of 20s from the farm of Aberdeen by Robert II to celebrate the anniversary of Master John Barber,

---

73. See Appendix, No.B/4(c)

74. The grant was normally termed as being through the king's alms, 'de antiqua elemosina regis'.

75. ER, iv, 22.

76. ER, iv, 31.

archdeacon of Aberdeen, who compiled a book 'de gestis illustrissimi principis quondam domini regis Roberti Bruys'.[77] The sums involved varied considerably. The chaplain praying in Moray Cathedral received an annual payment of only 8-8,[78] whereas the Carthusian Monastery of Perth received 50 marks annually from the burgh farms as part of a total pension of £60 for the purchase of 6 casks of wine.[79] This monastery, founded by James I, represented one of the best examples of the financial burden of such royal endowments. Not only did James I contribute largely to the building of the monastery itself, to the tune of 482 English nobles, £40-1-8 Flemish coin, and £172-13s Scots,[80] he also ensured that his foundation was well endowed. James agreed to endow the monastery with 200 marks and the rolls record the payment of part of that figure; for the house was allowed £60 annually from the customs and farms of the burgh of Perth for the purchase of 6 caks of wine, took over the annual pensions of £5 and 12s from the farms of the burgh, which had formerly been rendered to the Hospitals of St. Laurence and St. Mary Magdalene, and was also granted certain lands in the sheriffdom of Perth in mortmain.[81] The effect of these ecclesiastical pensions varied from burgh to burgh, for the entire mails of the burghs of Dumfries and Ayr were paid over to the local Dominican friars, while £69-5-4 of the total burgh farm of £80 of Perth was transferred to religious foundations.[82] Although pensions and annuities were the principal religious payments from the burgh farms, the bishop of Aberdeen was paid £21-6-8 annually from the farms of

---

77. ER, iv, 457.

78. ER, iv, 461.

79. ER, v, 354.

80. ER, iv, 508, 563, 564, 613, 621, 640,678. Calculated in Scots, the cost of the building of the monastery borne by the crown amounted to near £600.

81. ER, iv, cxiii, vi, 127, 137. RMS, ii, 347, 382.

82. ER, vi, 26, 32, 130. List of the Perth ecclesiastical annuities. Prior to the Carthusian Monastery of Perth, £33-6-8, £5 and 12s. Dominicans of Perth £14-13-4. Carmalite Friars of Perth £3-6-8. Abbot of Scone £5-3-4. Prior of St. Andrews 13-4. Abbot of Cambuskenneth £2-10s. Chaplain of St. Laurence £4.

Aberdeen as second teinds.[83]

Payments of lay pensions, although smaller than their ecclesiastical counterparts, were none the less considerable, calculated at £200 annually for the years 1457-60 and £226-8-8 annually for the period 1507-10.[84] Some were local payments, since the constables of Irvine and Kinghorn were both in receipt of their fees from the burgh mails.[85] For a brief period in the mid fifteenth century, the farms of Dumfries and Inverness were burdened with annual payment to the keepers of the royal castles of Lochmaben and Inverness.[86] Almost half the lay pension total was bound up in one grant, a royal grant of £100 annually from the farms of the burgh of Aberdeen to sir Thomas Erskine, which he held in heritage.[87] This hereditary pension from the burgh farms was granted by Robert II as part of an exchange agreement concerning certain lands in Arran.[88] As with the ecclesiastical annuities, some lay grants from the burgh farms originated in th reign of Robert I.[89] Many lay pensions payable from both the customs and the burgh farms seem to have ceased

---

83. ER, vi, 30. Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis, i, 86. The Register recorded a charter of David II to the bishops of Aberdeen of their rights to the teinds due from the sheriffdoms of Aberdeen and Banff, both inside and outside the burghs: 'tam infra burgos quam extra'. Tenth penny usually levied at the rate of 10% and paid, not by right, by through a royal grant.

84. Appendix No. B/4(c)

85. ER, vi, 27. Constable of Irvine paid 2 marks annually.
ER, vi, 37. Constable of Kinghorn, also the mair of the quarter of Kinghorn, paid £2 annually in heritage.

86. ER, vi, 239, 284, 325, 349, 442, 510, 561, 632, vi, 26. Lochmaben castle at 10 marks annually from the burgh farms of Dumfries.
ER, vi, 405, 441, vi, 29, 317. Inverness Castle at £42-16s annually from the burgh farms of Inverness.

87. ER, iv, 31.

88. ER, iv, 457.

89. Two hereditary £5 pensions to John Wright and Alexander Barcley of Garntully as dual heirs of Richard Randolph, granted by Robert I.

under the terms of the Act of 1424.[90] However, this attempt by James I to remove as many of these encumbrances as he could from the burgh accounts does not appear to have met with a great deal of success. Although the grant to Michael Mersar, of 20 marks in heritage from the burgh farms of Perth, ceased after the 1425 account,[91] several other pensions, those presumably who could show an indisputable legal right, continued in occupation.[92] In a 1425 'memorandum', the baillies of Kinghorn were ordered not to make any further payments to the constable of the burgh, £2 annually, or to John Lyon, 10s annually, until they had demonstrated to the lords of the Council their right to the hereditary pensions. By the terms of the first account of the baillies of Kinghorn in 1428, it would appear that the constable had successfully proved the legality of his claim, but that of John Lyon was dismissed.[93] Also, the conditions set out in the act of 1424 resulted in certain annuities from the accounts of the burgh baillies becoming bones of contention between the crown and certain royal pensioners. On 26 January 1379-80, sir Alexander Lindsay was granted a hereditary pension of £40 from the burgh farms of Aberdeen, but, after the 1425 account of the burgh baillies of Aberdeen, the allowance for the pension ceased to be recorded in the rolls.[94] Under the terms of the 1424 act, the farms associated with the pension reverted to the crown and James I was able to assert this right.[95]

---

90. APS, ii, 4. Fuller details, see the chapter on crown customs.

91. ER, iv, 395.

92. APS, ii, 4. Patrick Gray was granted a hereditary pension of £6 from the burgh farms of Dundee. Grant continued until at least 1513.

93. ER, iv, 396, 463.

94. RMS, i, 648. ER, iv, 397.

95. ER, v, 140. There is no further records of the pension under James I and there were no large arrears total to conceal the continuance of the payment. APS, ii, 4.

Withe the minority of James II, the revocation appears to have fallen into disuse, and in 1443, the baillies of the burgh were forced to seek an allowance for £160, as the earl of Crawford had siezed the opportunity of the crown's weak position to reaffirm his right to the pension.[96] Because of the powerful position of the earl in the North of Scotland, and the relative weakness of the crown at this junction, the baillies of the burgh of Aberdeen were not in a position to resist the claims of the earl of Crawford, and they were forced to continue to pay and claim allowance for the annuity.[97] However, on the death of Alexander, earl of Crawford, in 1453, with his son David still a minor, and with the defeat of his ally, the earl of Douglas, in 1455, James II accepted the opportunity to reassert the revocation of the pension in question by the act of 1455 of annexation.[98] In 1472 the position was again reversed, as David earl of Crawford successfully pursued the re-establishment of his pension from the farms of Aberdeen, aided certainly by his rise in the favour of the young James III, and, for the remainder of the late Medieval period, the crown never managed to reassert its claim.[99] From 1425, the crown attempted to annul the pension in question, but, except for two brief intervals, baronial resistance successfully counteracted royal pressure.

---

96. ER, v, 141. The pension was declared to have been taken by the earl into his own hands, 'ad manus proprias'.

97. ER, vi, 141, 187, 241, 283, 322, 404, 445, 567, 639.

98. ER, vi, 630, 639. In a joint statement concerning the pensions belonging to the earl of Crawford, from the customs and farms of Aberdeen, the revocation of 1424 by James I was quoted as the basis of the crown's claim, and it also stated that previous payment to the earl were made only under compulsion.

99. ER, viii, 205. Annuity continued to be paid to the earl until 1498 when, through a charter of James IV, it was paid over to Margaret Carmichael, the widow of the late earl David. RMS, ii, 1795, Paul, The Scots Peerage, iii, 23.

Realising the detrimental effect of hereditary grants and pensions on the king's income from the burgh farms, during the fifteenth century, annuities and payments from this source tended to be only for life,[100] at the king's pleasure or [101] for a specific number of years.[102] Instead of large pensions granted to the greatest magnates of the realm, in order to ensure their loyalty and continued support, from the reign of James I, fees and annuities tended to be conceded to royal servants, principally as reward for past or future service. Such men as John White, scribe, James Brownhill, royal tailor, and Donald McVat, the king's messenger, were in receipt of crown pensions from the burgh farms.[103] On 28 February 1482-3, Patrick Dickson received an annuity of £8-3-4 from the burgh farm of Peebles for 19 years as a reward for his part in the capture of James Elwald and other royal rebels.[104] As compared to the burgh farm grants of the fourteenth century, those of the next century were of much shorter duration and thus avoided the permanent alienation of crown revenues. However, in the fifteenth century, new grants in mortmain were still recorded. From the burgh farm of Forfar, a chaplain praying in the chapel of Finavon was granted an annuity of 10 marks annually from 1456.[105]

Payments from the burgh farms, other than those annuities paid to lay and ecclesiastic persons or institutions tended to make only haphazard appearances in the rolls and were often small in amount. Isolated allowances were recorded for such items as the purchase of supplies for the king and his

---

100. ER, x, 393.

101. ER, viii, 204. Recorded in the rolls as 'durante voluntate regis'.

102. ER, iv, 295-6.

103. ER, x, 66, 149, vii, 595.

104. ER, ix, 295-6.

105. ER, vii, 302. The payment was still recorded in 1513.

household, the expenses of carriage,[106] building[107] and diplomatic expenses[108] and other miscellaneous items of expenditure. The majority of these payments were of insignificant proportions, but in the 1435 account of the baillies of Inverness, £33-3s was allowed to pay for the expenses of the earl of Mar at the justice ayre in the burgh, and £41 allowed for the purchase of line for the construction of Inverness castle.[109] In 1426, the burgh baillies of Dumbarton and Stirling, sustained the cost of the wuartering Adam Ged and placing part of his dismembered body in the burgh squares, while the baillies of Edinburgh contributed £1-8-4 to defray the cost of transporting the quarters to the various burghs.[110] Most of these payments recorded single items of expenditure. But in the accounts of the burgh of Perth from 1405-6 to 1513, an annual allowance of £10-14-8 was granted for the building and sustaining of the bridge over the Tay, through a concession of Robert III, for the commemorate of his own soul and the souls of his wife, mother and son David, duke of Rothesay.[111] The charters for this are in Perth burgh charters SRO.

Because of the burden of these annuities, pensions and other expenses, there existed a wide gulf between the gross charge and the real income paid to the royal coffers.[112] In the years 1457-60 and 1507-10, the latter total amounted to only around 20% of the former, namely £121-18-8 out of £655-11s and £131-7-4 out of £688-16-8.[113] Despite the crown's attempts to remove

---

106. ER, iv, 25, 423, 424, 460, 637, v, 405.

107. ER, iv, 524, 533, xii, 174.

108. ER, iv, 585, 633, vi, 135.

109. ER, iv, 634.

110. ER, iv, 418, 421, 425.

111. ER, iv, 29.

112. Gross income was equivalent to the charge: Real income refers to the cash paid to the king's comptroller.

113. Appendix No.B/4(c)

hereditary pensions, and the general increase in financial efficiency in the later fifteenth century, the real crown income from the burgh farms revealed little overall increase. However, as with other items of crown income, during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the actual amounts involved fluctuated considerably, normally in proportion to the number of the burghs that accounted to the Exchequer. The effect of perpetual lay and ecclesiastical pensions can be demonstrated in the years of the regency of the dukes of Albany, where the annual real income to the crown rarely stretched beyond £30, but with attempts at retrenchment under James I the totals rose dramatically to a peak of £210, the average annual crown income for the years 1426-30. After the fall in the minority of James II, the income from the burgh farms tended to level out for the remainder of the fifteenth century. Although the chart revealed certain fluctuations, the impression is slightly misleading, for the burghs which tended to contribute the most, namely Aberdeen, Inverness and Banff, tended also to be the most irregular in accounting. After 1500, when the majority of the burghs tended to account with greater regularity, in contrast, the accounts revealed a slight decline in their real revenue to the crown. During the active reign of James IV, an overall increase in the numbers of pensions, annuities and fees also affected the accounts of the burgh baillies. At this period, George Bard was granted a 20 mark fee from the farms of Banff,[114] Nicholas MacBrare a 10 mark pension from the farms of Dumfries,[115] clerks copying the Exchequer Rolls were gifted £10 from the farms of Haddington,[116] and from the farms of Peebles, Alexander Vaich of Dawick received a pension of £8 for 'his gude and thankfull service... and in speciale for the keping and

---

114. ER, xii, 499.

115. ER, xii, 495.

116. ER, xii, 496.

and feding of herouns'.[117] Although these allowances were not extensive in themselves, within the limited scope of the accounts of the burgh baillies, their effect was clearly obvious.[118]

'Because the land of the burghs is the king's land, and because the king enjoys a revenue from his burgh in rents, tolls and other issues, so the king has something he can give away; and the gift may be more than one of a toft and tenement'.[119] As with the lands in the property rolls, the king was entitled to grant away an entire burgh as a gift, a practice which seems to have continued throughout the medievel period.[120] In 1501, the baillies of Fyvie were required to enter their annual farm and those responsible for withholding the farms since the last account in 1332-3 were to be summoned, but, nevertheless, through a charter granted to George Meldrum in January 1502-3, it appears that William Meldrum of Fyvie had been in possession of the farms and annual returns of the burgh.[121] However, it appears that William Meldrum had to assert his claim to the profits of the burgh against crown pressure. On 13 December 1501, William Meldrum, Malcolm Forbes of Touchone and William Blackhall of that ilk were accused of destroying the burgh, 'makand it to be telit and sawin quhare the housis and biggingis tharof was situat' and defrauding the king of the profits of the burgh. The sheriff of Aberdeen was directed to distrain for the farms, £6-13-4 annually, for the previous Martinmas term and to ensure that the king obtained all the profits in the future. Evidence of claims regarding the burgh and its

---

117. ER, xii, 493, RSS, i, 1937.

118. Appendix No.B/4(c)

119. Dickinson, Early Records of Aberdeen, Scot, Hist. Soc. lxlx.

120. For Fourteenth century examples, see Ibid, lxix-lxx.

121. ER, xi, 384. RMS, ii, 2690.

revenues were to be studied on 10 February, and, since there are no further accounts of the burgh of Fyvie in the Exchequer rolls and since George Meldrum was in receipt of a royal charter in 1502-3, the king's claim seems to have been disregarded.[122] The absence of the burghs of Wigtown and Kirkcudbright from the early fifteenth century burgh rolls was occasioned by their being in the hands of the earls of Douglas, until their forfeiture in 1455.[123] In the first account of the burgh of Nairn in 1507, it was stated that previously Elizabeth, countess of Ross had retained the farms in her own hands through her liferent grant.[124] For the same reason, the burgh farms of Nairn were not to be charged to the chamberlain of Ross, after the forfeiture of the earldom from John lord of the Isles.[125] Part of the grant received by David, earl of Crawford, from James III on 18 May 1488 on the occasion of his erection of the dukedom of Montrose, included the royal burgh of Montrose, which David was to hold in heritage.[126] With the defeat of the forces of James III at Sauchieburn a few days later, David was unable to gain possession of his gift until 1490. Under the terms of the confirmation of the gift by James IV, the earl was now to hold the burgh only for his lifetime; the crown suffered only six years' loss of revenue since David died at Christmas 1494.[127] Baronial interference in the burgh of Selkirk was not so complete. In 1473, the burgh farms were leased to John Cranstone for the period of five years, and after the expiry of the term, he retained control of the burgh accounts, but this time at the

---

122. ADC, (Stair Society), 120.

123. APS, ii, 75.

124. ER, xii, 606.

125. ER, viii, 596.

126. RMS, ii, 1725.

127. RMS, ii, 1895. ER, x, 623. The earl of Crawford received no profit from his grant between 1488 and 1490, but from 1490 to 1496, ER, x, 148. 243, he retained £1-2-8 annually, the sum previously paid to the comptroller. On his death the entry ceased. Paul, Scots Peerage, iii, 23.

king's tolerance.[128] During the period of Cranstone's control of the burgh accounts, until the latter were feued in 1498, accounts continued to be rendered regularly in the Exchequer, but when, in September 1506, the burgh farms and small customs were granted by James IV to James Furray of Fauldhill, who was bound by the terms of the charter granted under the great seal to render an annual account in the Exchequer, the accounts of the burgh of Selkirk disappeared from the rolls.[129]

Apart from official royal grants and gifts of burgh farms and other returns, the gross returns from this source, in common with the property accounts, suffered also from more disputable baronial interference. On two separate occasions, the burgh of Inverkeithing was forced to resort to judicial action over the infringement of its rights to small customs by William, earl of Sutherland, and later by Robert Douglas of Lochleven.[130] On 23 June 1503, the aldermen and baillies of the burgh of Elgin complained that their rights to the fishing of the River Spey, which had been leased to the burgh by the crown, was being infringed by Alexander Innes of that ilk.[131] In the early fifteenth century crown revenue from the burgh farms was extremely vulnerable to baronial interference. During the periods of crown weakness, namely the regencies of the dukes of Albany, and the minority of James II, many local magnates and barons gratefully accepted the opportunity of diverting crown revenue into their own pockets. In 1414, the baillies of Crail stated under oath, that John St. Clair of Newburgh siezed £3-6-8 from them by force, and as he was the owner of the tower of Crail, they were unable to resist him.[132] During the early years of James I's effective reign and

---

128. ER, viii, 206, 260, 323, 398, 470, 637, ix, 162, 453, 552.

129. ER, xv, 81. The burgh of Selkirk did not account for the period 1506 to 1522.

130. ADC, i, 12. ADA, 59-60. ADC, Vol. xii, f 92.

131. ADC, Vol. xiv, f 171.

132. ER, iv, 205.

the minority of James II, until the death of Alexander, earl of Ross, the burgh farms of Inverness, in common with the customs of the same burgh, were constantly plundered by the earl. In the 1428 account of the baillies of Inverness, the balance at the foot of the account, at £60-12-1, was apparently paid over to the earl and Alan Ranaldson through the mandate of the duke of Albany.[133] Between 1436 and 1448, Alexander earl of Ross removed a total of £514-16s from the burgh accounts,[134] and his son John, the year after the death of James II, seized £42-18s from the same source.[135] As well as direct removal of crown revenue, the destructive raid of these highlandmen on the burgh of Inverness caused allowances to be granted to the baillies, in 1430 at +£52-18s for a fire started by the lord of the Isles, and in 1435, at £42-18s, for damage caused by his raids on the burgh.[136] Without any royal protection during the years in question, the burgh baillies of Inverness were unable to stay the regular loss of revenue. In 1441, Alexander Seaton, lord of Gordon, claiming to be the receiver of all the king's revenue beyond the mountains, 'ultra montes', collected £39 from the burgh farms of Banff 'by extortion'.[137] It was only natural that most of the examples of such interference and violent assumptions of crown revenue occurred in the north where royal control was even looser than in other areas of Scotland. Although the reigns of James III and IV witnessed considerably less baronial interference with burgh revenues, there were instances of men being summoned to answer for

---

133. ER, iv, 461.

134. ER, iv, 199, 286, 325. Alexander earl of Ross died on the 8 May 1449, Paul, Scots Peerage, v, 44. His son Donald was a minor, ER, v, xci. Although the earl removed most of the burgh farm it is noticeable that the two pensions to the Dominicans of Inverness and the chaplain in Moray Cathedral, were not taken by the earl.

135. ER, vii, 513.

136. ER, v, 515, 633.

137. ER, v, 106.

the appropriation of burgh farms. In 1491, Walter Ker of Cessford intromitted with the past farms of Jedburgh and had received the issues of the small customs. For the former he was summoned to account, and concerning the latter, he was discharged for all previous terms by royal letter, and in future the baillies were required to render annual account for both.[138] The case of the burgh of Kintore represented a struggle between a local landlord, John Leslie of Wardris, and the crown over the destiny of the burgh farms. In a 1501 'memorandum', the crown reasserted its interest in the revenues of the royal burgh, which, it was declared, were levied at 20 marks annually and had not accounted at the Exchequer since 9 March 1332-3. The king ordered an inquiry, with both the burgh baillies and the intromitters being summoned.[139] In the resulting judicial proceedings, the burgh baillies were ordered to render future accounts for the farms at 20 marks per annum, and John Leslie was ordered not to interfere.[140] On 27 March 1503, John Leslie was summoned at the instance of the king and the baillies of Kintore to produce evidence of his infeftment in the lands and barony of Kintore and the burgh mails, and to make account and reckoning of the latter. The case was to be continued until 8 July, and in the meantime, the clerk of the register was instructed to 'consider the ald rollis and new rollis and til avise with the thanedome and dawarkis and burgh of Kintor and how the thanedome is distinct fra the sade burgh and dawarkis and quhat thai extend to be yeire'.[141] Despite the

---

138. ER, x, 465-6. Despite the latter mandate, in the 1496 account Walter Ker still raised the small customs of the burgh, valued at £2 annually. Until 1513 only the burgh farms entered the account, with no mention of the small customs.

139. ER, xi, 384.

140. ADC, (Stair Society), 120-1.

141. ADC, if, f 93.

charter of new infetments to the burgh, which included a 'reddendo' of burgh farms, and the fact that payments of £6 were recorded from burgh baillies to the comptroller, and later to Exchequer clerks from 1502 to 1508, John Leslie appears to have reasserted his right to the burgh farms.[142] After 1508, accounts of the burgh farms of Kintore ceased to be recorded in the Exchequer rolls, and in 1518, the burgh was censured for failure to account, with the baillies using the constant intromissions of John Leslie as their excuse.[143]

Apart from baronial inroads into the returns from the royal burghs, two other principal factors contributed to a loss of crown revenue. Firstly, as mentioned above in the case of the burgh of Inverness, wanton destruction, fire and general wastage frequently reduced the financial potential of the royal burgh. During periods of unrest on the borders, the burghs of Jedburgh, Selkirk and Berwick were, on several occasions, forced to seek allowances for their inability to make full payment. Intense border activity prior to the recovery of the burgh of Berwick by the English in 1482 was reflected in the accounts of that burgh. In the four years 1477-81, a total of £123-10-4 from the burgh farms was assignated lost through wastage, and was stated to be 'irrecoverable'.[144] Since a state of continual border friction existed from 1481 to 1486, John Cranstone, the accountant of the burghs of Selkirk and Jedburgh, was unable to collect the farms, valued at £50-13-4, and the king permitted him to pay the comptroller a composition of £33-6-8, the remainder being remitted.[145] Disturbances in the North during the reigns

---

142. RMS, ii, 3047. The charter was granted on the pretext that the old charter had been destroyed by civil unrest and fire.
ER, xii, 478, 609, xiii, 114.

143. ADC, iii, 126. In the same decree the baillies of Nairn were accused of withholding £10 annually for 7 years from the comptroller since 1510, and that both the burghs, that is Nairn and Kintore, 'have tynt thair privilege and fredome', which is in recognition to the king to be disposed of by him at his pleasure.

144. ER, viii, 551-2, 633-4, ix, 81-2, 157-8.

145. ER, ix, 552.

of James III and IV also robbed the king of full payment from farms of certain royal burghs. In 1492, the baillies of the burgh of Inverness compounded with the lords of the Council for the sum of £375-0-8 and 35 lbs. of pepper, which represented arrears of considerable antiquity. The baillies agreed to pay £35-13-4 to the comptroller, Duncan Forrester, for the total arrears, since the poverty of the burgesses and the inhabitants, exacerabated by a continual state of hostility and unrest in the area, during which both the burgh and the castle were destroyed, made full payment of royal dues impossible.[146] Further allowances and remissions were recorded on other occasions to these burghs on similar pretexts. Undoubtedly there was some truth in the assertions of poverty and disorder by the burgh accountants, yet there were probably occasions when such pleas were offered as a means for obviating regular payment of the full amount due to the crown.

As with many other accountants in the late medieval period in Scotland, arrears totals were not uncommon in the accounts of the burgh baillies. Again, these totals may have hidden attempts to defraud the crown of its full revenue. Unlike most other accounts, arrears totals in the burgh baillie accounts tended not to be of a temporary nature, but, rather, permanent and frequently irrecoverable. Concerning the settlement of the arrears total of the 1492 burgh account of Inverness, mentioned in the previous paragraph, the total had been building up throughout the 1480s and early 1490s, and, on settlement, only a fraction of the sum found its way into the king's coffers.[147] It was only in the 1505 account of the baillies of Edinburgh that a settlement of the £30 arrears, charged 50 years previous as pledges for deforcement, was achieved.[148]

The crown's attitude to these arrears varied; in 1454 the baillies of Crail

---

146. ER, x, 370.

147. ER, ix, 205, 230, 452, x, 370.

148. ER, xii, 384.

were ordered to pay up their arrears of £2 within 40 days,[149] in 1462, the baillies of Edinburgh were remitted their arrears of £40 'through the grace and favour of the king',[150] while in 1461, George Leche, Thomas Weir and Thomas Hetoun, burgesses of Lanark, the king's debtors for an arrears total of £8 from the account of the burgh of Lanark, were to pay the sum to the king before next Whitsun or enter themselves in ward in Edinburgh Castle until full payment was achieved.[151] In the majority of cases, since many of the burgh accounts were simple in form and dealt only with a limited amount of cash, arrears totals tended to be small in size. In most cases the efficiency and honesty of the baillies was not tested but where old arrears were settled to the disadvantage of the crown, suggestions of fraud on the part of the baillies would seem to contain an element of truth.[152] However, in the 1478 and 1479 accounts of the baillies of Berwick, the latter found themselves superexpended on their accounts to the tune of £50-0-7 and £69-12-4 respectively. This was unique in burgh accounts. The baillies were quickly recompensed, firstly through the sale of the salmon rest from the fishings of the Tweed, and secondly through being reimbursed from the accounts of the custumars of the burgh of Berwick.[153] Financial co-operation between the burgh baillies and other accounts was a fairly common occurrance. Between 1438 and 1441, the baillies of Perth contributed

---

149. ER, v, 640. But the sum still remained in the balance at the foot of the 1455 account.

150. ER, vii, 162.

151. ER, vii, 44.-

152. ER, x, 622.

153. ER, viii, 551-2, 621, 633-4. The main causes of the overexpenditure were payments made to Robert Lauder of Bass for the office of keeper of Berwick castle at 200 marks annually, and £50 paid, in 1478, for the repair of the gates and buildings inside the castle.

£133-6-8 to offset the superexpenses of the custumars of the same burgh.[154] In 1454, the baillies of Aberdeen submitted £12-13-4, and in the following year, a further £30 to the accounts of Alexander Young, chamberlain of the king's lands north of the River Dee.[155]

Apart from accounting for the issues of the chamberlain ayres for a limited period in the fifteenth century, already mentioned above, there existed only isolated instances of the burghs gaining further inroads into crown jurisdiction. Certain of the larger royal burghs obtained charters, granting them the office of sheriff 'within their own bounds'. By the terms of the Edinburgh charter of 1482, the burgh was granted the issues of its own court.[156] In the 1494 account of the Edinburgh baillies, the issues of the justice ayre and of the sheriff court were to be charged to the sheriff of Edinburgh 'inside the burgh'.[157] A similar grant was made to the burgh of Perth in 1394 by Robert III, and the Exchequer rolls recorded isolated accounts of the sheriff.[158] The right of escheate, even those resulting from contravention of the burghs' trading privileges, was retained by the crown. But in an effort to clamp down on these crimes, special royal grants were issued to certain sheriffs and burghs, encouraging them to intensify their activities against these transgressors by allowing them half of the escheates, the other half remaining with the crown.[159] In 5108, the baillies of Montrose, under the terms of a similar concession, received an allowance for £5-2-6, namely half the value of the escheated goods of John Tailor and Thomas Crum, who had contravened the liberties of the burgh.[160]

---

154. ER, v, 43, 76, 105.

155. ER, v, 639, 654, vi, 42, 68.

156. Charters and other Documents relating to the City of Edinburgh, Burgh Records Society, 54.

157. ER, x, 466.

158. See chapter on the sheriffs' accounts. ER, v, 76, 106, 245, 280, vi, 88, 149, xi, 303.

159. RSS, i, 927.

160. ER, xiii, 107.

THE CUSTOMS ACCOUNTS

As well as submitting a fixed annual feufarm to the crown, most of the royal burghs were also required to account annually for the great customs.[1] In the later Middle Ages the issues from the great customs were, in Scotland, payable mostly from exports, although certain imports carried custom levies. In common with the accounts of the burgh baillies, those of the custumars are fairly well preserved from the mid fourteenth century to the early sixteenth and beyond with only a few individual years for which no accounts have survived. From the evidence provided by these accounts it is possible to gain an insight not only into the fiscal contribution of the royal customs, but also into the nature and extent of Scotland's export trade.

The great customs were collected by custumars, who were directly responsible to the crown for their receipts and who were in receipt of a fee of 4d for every pound worth of custom declared in the charge.[2] In theory, by basing the fee on the gross amount of custom collected, it should have encouraged the custumar to ensure the full collection of all customs due, but corruptive influences seem to have offered greater rewards. The majority of royal custumars originated from the leading burgess families of the burgh concerned. The custumars of Dundee, for instance, were derived from mercantile families long established in burghal affairs, men like David Spalding, James and David Rollok, James Wedderburn and Malcolm Guthrie.[3] The office of custumar within other royal burghs attracted members of the local gentry and artistocracy. In 1505, for instance, William McLellan of Bomby and John Hepburn of Rollandstone were responsible for customs receipts from the ports of Kirkcudbright and Haddington respectively, while from 1505 to 1509 James, lord Ogilvy collected the customs levied at the burgh of

---

1. In contrast, small customs represented a toll of nearly all articles brought to the burgh market from both local and foreign sources. They were normally levied along with the burgh farm.

2. ER, ii, LXXXVI.

3. See Appendix A/1(C)

Arbroath.[4] Although the evidence is far from convincing, it would seem probable that the office of custumar was purchased. A fee was undoubtedly charged by the crown on the issuing of the letter of grant. This was especially likely as the office of custumar appears to have been in considerable demand judging by the fact that it attracted the leading elements of both rural and urban society. The popularity of the investment must have centred round the acceptance of bribes from those engaged in smuggling and custom evasion. In return for overlooking these clandestine activities or even for actively participating in defrauding the crown, the custumar would have received financial consideration. The position of custumar would probably have reduced the merchant's own customs bills for the duration of the tenure. The position of the custumar of Edinburgh was exceptional, not only because the burgh was gradually becoming the centre of government, thus restricting the avenues for corruption, but also on account of its predominant position as regards Scotland's export trade. From the reign of James I, the position of custumar of Edinburgh was of prime importance to the crown since the income from the great customs far outstripped those collected at any other Scottish burgh. As a result, successive monarchs in the fifteenth century used that position as one of the principal means of repaying crown debts. Many of the merchants appointed to the office of custumar were heavily involved in royal finances and were frequently contracted as royal suppliers. There is little doubt that the crown relied on the wealth of leading Edinburgh merchants on both counts. Concerning the former, sir John Forrester, deputy chamberlain under the Albanys and chamberlain after the return of James I, held the office of custumar from 1406 to 1434 while comptollers, Alexander Napier of Merchiston, Thomas Simpson of Knockhill, George Robinson, Alexander Inglis and Andrew, bishop of Caithness also retained the office of custumar of Edinburgh not only to offset the personal losses incurred during their term

---

4. ER, xii, 368, 370, xiii, 235.

as comptroller but also in order to widen the financial responsibility of that official so as to reduce the insolvency of the comptroller's accounts during the fifteenth century.[5] The personal involvement of George Robinson in the office of comptroller must have been considerable, for, from 1476 until March 1487-8 he retained the office of custumar of Edinburgh (which included the cloth accounts),[6] in his account of 1483 he received an allowance for £1,018 from the rest of his last account as repayment for his expenses on building two rowbarges, purchasing iron for serpentines and guns, paying workmen engaged in minting black money, for the shipment of wine and other smaller outlays,[7] and on 6 April 1483 his son, George, was granted a life pension of £20 annually from the Customs.[8] There seems little doubt that Robinson acted as one of the principal financial props of the crown, especially during the crisis years of the early 1480s. In addition, the failure to pay royal suppliers in full probably accounted for the appointment of many Edinburgh burgesses to the office of custumar, for instance John Turing, employed by James I to conduct royal business in Flanders, using funds from the king's ransom as well as customs returns from Edinburgh,[9] occupied the office of custumar from 1425 to 1434 and again for eighteen months from January 1440-1, William Bully, who was in receipt of substantial sums of money from the Edinburgh customs,[10] was responsible for customs duties levied at Edinburgh for eight years during the reign of James II, Andrew Crawford, who organized the collection of the tax from the

---

5. See Appendix A/1(d)
6. See Appendix A/1(d). George Robinson acted as custumar of the cloth exports from Edinburgh from July 1473, added to his later appointment as custumar of Edinburgh in 1476. Between 1476 and March 1487-8, he relinquished his charge only for the short period between August 1482 and March 1482-3.
7. ER, ix, 218-9.
8. ER, ix, 221.
9. ER, iv, 412, 437, 438, 472, 509, 672-85.
10. ER, v, 22, 32, 52, 148, 347, 551, 605.

burghs and loans from various burgesses in 1458,[11] was custumar for goods imported into, and also for salmon exported from, Leith for most of the years between December 1452 and June 1467 and finally George Halkerstone allowed the free export of his merchandise from Edinburgh, filled the office at the end of James IV's reign.[12] Throughout the fifteenth century, the Scottish crown relied heavily on the wealth of the Edinburgh burgesses for financial support and many of their number were partly rewarded or reimbursed by appointment to the various customs offices associated with that burgh. A similar motivation many have been behind the appointment of Peregrine Grellus, the Genoese merchant seems to have acted as royal factor for James I, to the office of custumar of Kirkcudbright between 1455 and 1460.[13]

Although statutory regulation provided for the appointment of two custumars for each royal burgh, there were several exceptions to this rule.[14] In 1511 the customs levied from the ports of Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Dundee were collected by only one custumar.[15] In addition, it was not unusual for one custumar to account for the dues accumulated from more than a single burgh. In 1508, for instance, John Brown was responsible for the customs duties collected from the burghs of Ayr and Irvine, William Stirling for Dumbarton and 'Lowis' or Lochfyne, William McLellan of Bomby for Kirkcudbright and Wigtown and Andrew Ayton for all the royal burghs located in Moray, Ross and Caithness.[16] Burghs with small customs declarations normally required the services of only one custumar. In 1487, fourteen out of a total of seventeen custumar's accounts were under the control of a single official.[17]

---

11. ER, vi, 305, 311, 383, 498.
12. ER, xiii, 367.
13. ER, vi, 125, 202, 303, 494, 594.
14. APS, ii, 9.
15. ER, xiii, 384, 389,390.
16. ER, xiii, 84, 87, 88, 91.
17. ER, ix, 536-548.

In contrast, in the larger burghs, separate accounts were rendered for certain commodities, as in Aberdeen for salmon and cloth exports and Edinburgh for the custom levied on imported merchandise from England and cloth.[18] Concerning the latter burgh, from 1467 until March 1482-3 three distinct accounts were rendered for the customs derived from Wool, woolfells and hides, from salmon and imported goods and from cloth, but from the latter date, all three accounts were merged together under George Robinson.[19]

Custumars were appointed by the crown by means of a commission issued under the privy seal. The length of tenure of the office of custumar seems to have varied considerably from one appointment to another; on 26 February 1499-1500 'a letter of custumary of the town of Perth made to Andro Mackisoun of woll, hid, skinnys, claith, fisch .... that aw the kingis henes custum... with power to mak deputis under him to endure for one year and thereafter for the king's will, while on 29 June 1501 Robert Danielson was appointed custumar of Linlithgow at the king's pleasure 'quhill it be specialy revokit be the kingis henes'.[20] Other appointments tended to be more specific, for, in 1505 James Rollok, burgess of Dundee, and his son Robert received a grant of the office of custumar of the burgh of Dundee 'and the schirefdom of the sammyn' for five years and in the following year, Patrick Kincragy and Andrew Mathieson were in receipt of similar grants for the burgh of Perth for the duration of three years.[21] There does not appear to have been a large overturn of custumars during the fifteenth century. Custumars of Dundee, for instance, tended to retain office for long periods, often until the death of the holder. David Spalding held the office of custumar of Dundee for two periods, from 1437 to 1441 and again from 1444 to 1474, a

---

18. ER, v, 16, 553.

19. See Appendix A/1(d)

20. RSS, i, 484, 708.

21. RSS, i, 1126, 1311.

total of forty four years, while James Rollok accounted for the customs of the burgh between 1483 and 1488 and between 1492 and 1509.[22]

In addition to the custumar, a fee of 1d on every sack of wool weighed was payable to the tronar, the person in charge of the tron, a large balance used for weighing wool bound for export.[23] It would appear that other custom officials also tended to have long tenures of office. On 20 March 1501-2 Alexander Tiry, burgess of Perth, was appointed to the office clerk of the cocket, keeper of the cocket seal and 'seare of the skynnis and al uther gudis awing custume' for life.[24] In 1413 David Paniter received the office of clerk of the cocket in the burgh of Montrose, also for life, and for the execution of his office, the king granted him 'all dewteis aucht and wont'.[25] The clerk of the cocket and other minor port officials were presumably paid a small fee on the occasion of the export by each individual merchant.

Royal customs appears to have been one section of the king's income which, during the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, escaped the rigorous exploitation which befell royal property and feudal casualties. In fact, the accounts of the custumars revealed little alteration in form between the early fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries. However, the overriding feature of these accounts was the steady decline in the gross customs returns during the fifteenth century. Taking the annual average of the customs returns for a period of four years, from a peak of £10,750 between 1368-9 and 1375-6 there was a dramatic decline in these returns during the period of the early Stewarts and the Albany regencies since the years 1418-22 recorded an average annual return of only £2,711. In the general

---

22. See Appendix A/1(c)

23. ER, ii, LXXXVI

24. RSS, i, 791.

25. RSS, i, 2490.

climate of financial retrenchment during the effective reign of James I, there was a definite increase in the gross customs' receipts which averaged around £5,700 annually. However, with the long and difficult minority of James II the annual level dropped to between £2,000 and £3,000. During the remainder of the late fifteenth century the gross income from the great customs rose little above that level, averaging between £2,000 and £3,600 annually. Naturally the returns fluctuated according to the vicissitudes of international trade, and the intensity of evasion, but between 1450 and 1458 and againe between 1482 and 1490, receipts were uncommonly low, while on the other hand, between 1442 and 1450 and again between 1498 and 1513, there was a definite upward trend.[26] Despite these fluctuations, the customs figures revealed that the Scottish export trade was, during most of the fifteenth century suffering from a period of stagnation. Although smuggling and evasion represented an unknown variable in such calculations, there is no conclusive evidence to show that such activities reached a peak at any particular point during the century.

Until the return of James I from captivity in England in 1424, customs returns were based on only three exports, wool, hides and woolfells. These three commodities ranked among the principal exports of Scotland, but their character,being the unmanufactured produce of the countryside, revealed the unsophisticated nature of the Scottish economy. In the mid fourteenth century and in response to the need to provide for the ransom of David II, the rates of custom levied on wool, hides and woolfells were quadrupled between 1357 and 1368.[27] Inevitably, since the customs assessment on wool was increased from 6/8 to 2 marks for every sack exported, from 1 mark to 4 marks on every last of hides and from 3/4 to 13/4 on every hundred woolfells the income derived from this source rose substantially. Between 1368-9 and 1375-6 the average annual gross receipt from the customs of these three

---

26. See Appendix B/5(b)

27. ER, ii, XLI-LXXII.

articles amounted to £10,750 and in the single year from 1371-2 to 1372-3 the gross receipt totalled £13,370.[28] However, from the late fourteenth century, there was a steady decline both in amount of customs revenue extracted from these commodities and in the total amounts exported. For example, in the 1370s the average annual export of wool, on which custom was paid amounted to 526 lasts but by the reign of James I the level had fallen to 357 lasts. During the reigns of James II, III and IV the export figures for wool continued to decline sharply; in the late 1460s the average annual export was only 173 lasts and by the first five years of the sixteenth century only 123 lasts of wool were assessed for custom.[29] Similar trends were obvious concerning the export of hides and woolfells, although not in such dramatic proportions as wool. For instance, the average annual export of hides in the 1370s stood at 194 lats, and although the figures declined in the fifteenth century, by the first decade of the sixteenth century around 120 lasts of hides were being exported annually.[30] One of the main features of English trade in the fifteenth century was the growth in the export of manufactured cloth in place of the exportation of raw wool, the latter declining as an English export from the second half of the fourteenth century. Behind this revolution in English exporting patterns was not only the employment of available wool in the manufacture of cloth but also a temporary halt in the breeding of sheep.[31] The decline in wool exports from England to Flanders which began around 1350, continued sharply for the remainder of the later Mediaeval period. Around the mid fourteenth century, at total of over 30,000 sacks of wool were exported from English

---

28. ER, ii, 311-484.

29. These average annual export figures for wool were assessed for the years 1372-3 to 1377-8, 1425 to 1430, 1465 to 1469 and from 1501 to 1505. These particular years were selected because they represented periods of relative prosperity, thus ensuring a consistant assessment of the position. For the purposes of the Customs Accounts, wool was measured in lasts, sacks and stones.

30. ER, ii, 311-484, xii, 78-474.

31. Power and Postan, English Trade in the Fifteenth Century, 10-12

ports, by the 1390s the total had fallen to 19,000 sacks and by the mid fifteenth century, the average annual export was only around 8,000 sacks.[32] However, English customs returns were compensated for the loss of revenue through the decline in wool exports by a corresponding increase in the export of cloth in its stead.[33] In contrast, the decline of wool exportation in fifteenth century Scotland was accompanied by no such compensatory factor. The effect of declining wool exports on the gross customs returns in fifteenth century Scotland was dramatic, for between 1428-34 the average annual return from the export of wool amounted to £4,259 but the 1502-6 its contribution had dropped to £1,653. Similarly the customs returns on woolfells revealed a similar decline, from £465 in the former period to £276 in the latter. The contribution from hides does not seem to have varied to any great extent during the fifteenth century.[34] After the wars of independance there appears to have been a steady contraction in the sheep population in Scotland, undoubtedly due in part to the effects of foreign invasion and the combined disruptive forces of political opportunism and judicial weakness. Also, the loss of Berwick and Roxburgh in the fourteenth century must have had a detrimental effect on the wool figures.

During the fourteenth century and the first two decades of the fifteenth, only wool, woolfells and hides were liable for customs duties, but James I, in an attempt to augment the contribution of the customs to his

---

32. Figures for wool exports from England during the early fifteenth century

1392-5	Annual	average	of	19,359	sacks	of wool.
1410-15	"	"	"	13,625	"	" "
1446-8	"	"	"	7,654	"	" "
1448-59	"	"	"	8,175	"	" "

33. Miskimin, The Economy of Early Renaissance Europe, 94. Chart of export trends of cloth and wool from England.

34. ER, iv, 465-576, xii, 78-474.

1428-34	£4,259	Wool	£465	Woolfells	£312 Hides
1446-50	£2,861	"	£413	"	£302 "
1474-8	£2,217	"	£312	"	£365 "
1502-6	£1,653	"	£276	"	£326 "

annual income, introduced customs levies on additional commodities. There was an air of desperation about James I's preoccupation with the discovery of new sources of revenue, a fact which was reflected in his policy over the great customs. It would have been impractical to raise the levy on goods already assessed for custom duties, firstly, since it was not long since David II had quadrupled the levy and secondly there was a substanital decline in the export figures of these traditional commodities. The alternative was to introduce customs levies on other merchandise. In the customs accounts following the return of James I from England, the gross charge contained returns from cloth, salmon, cod, herring, salt, a variety of pelts, suet and various smaller items, which were exported from Scottish ports. Undoubtedly these commodities had been exported by Scottish and foreign merchants before the time of James I but it was only now that customs duties were being levied on their export. Of these, the most lucrative were cloth and various types of fish. In Scotland, the gross customs duty derived from the export of manufactured cloth failed to compensate for the loss of revenue resulting from the decline in wool exports, as it did in England. Nevertheless, it would be fair to say that the cloth exports from Scotland flourished in the later fifteenth century. In the reigns of James II and III, cloth custom returns tended to vary from between £150 and £200 annually but, during the reign of James IV, the level was raised to between £300 and £350, while the years 1509-10 and 1510-11 recorded gross returns of £417 and £420.[35] Despite this increase in the customs returns from cloth, the latter still lagged a long way behind the wool levy, which, irrespective of its declining returns, still remained the principal source of customs revenue.[36] The gross income from the custom levied on the export of various types of fish - mainly salmon, cod

---

35. See Appendix No.B/5(j) ER, xiii, 359-72, 381-391.

36. See Appendix No.B/5 (j)

and herring - was normally on a par with that derived from cloth, averaging between £250 and £350 in the reign of James IV. However, the returns tended to fluctuate considerably, for between 1475 and 1481 the average annual custom return from the export of fish amounted to £557.[37] Of the remaining exports, pelts of diverse types, salt and suet made regular, though small contributions to the total custom returns. In addition, an import levy was charged on all goods originating from England. The most common articles of import from England proved to be grain of diverse varieties, peas, cloth, wine, iron, lead and various other items. The income from this source rarely advanced beyond £50 annually and in the case of imported grain, was frequently collected in kind which might, at a later date, be commuted to cash. However, in 1511 the custom charged on English goods reached to extraordinarily lofty figure of £190-8-6, including £144-10/- levied on the importation of a large quantity of wax and smaller returns from sugar, tar, salt, potash, cloth, barley and beans.[38]

The principal Scottish exports consisted of rural products which left Scotland in their raw state. Wool, by far the largest commodity exported from Scotland, was customed not on the value of the commodity but by weight. From 1368 a levy of £1-6-8 was charged on every sack of wool (a sack was equivalent to 24 stones), a rate which continued throughout the remainder of the later Mediaeval period. The wool was weighed by the tronar and the customs assessment was based on his findings. A memorandum realting to the weighing of the wool stipulated that 'the woll was iustlie vyit the tyme of the custuming thairof, lykas it aucht and suld be yit without ony pull or warp, wranguslie and faslie usit be merchandis this day quhane the samen is custumat.[39]

---

37. ER, viii, 380 - ix, 154.

38. ER, xiii, 384, 390-1.

39. The memorandum on customs was probably composed by sir John Skene and based on the evidence of the Exchequer Rolls. SRO. Exchequer Customs (Papers and Accounts), No.2.

In 1368 a stature required that the custom on skins and hides was to be proportional to that on wool.[40] However, woolfells were customed at the rate of 1 mark for every hundred (that is the long hundred of 120 in modern calculation) while every last of hides was liable for a levy of 4 marks.[41] During the reign of James I fresh imposts were levied on skins other than woolfells. Certain inferior qualities of skin were assessed at rates lower than the woolfells; shorlings at 6/8 per hundred, scaldings and footfells at 3/4 and lentrinware at 1/-.[42] In addition, a series of imposts were established for the exports of the skins of the martin, polecat, otter, fox, hart, roe, hind and doe, but which brought little financial reward to the Exchequer.[43] Skins were 'numberit and tauld be ane officiar deput to that effect, callit 'numerator pellium'', who, in 1447 in Edinburgh received a fee of 50/-.[44]

The 1424 Parliament of James I also fixed the customs rate on the export of the products of the sea. An 'ad valorem' duty of 2/6 in the pound was levied on salmon 'bocht be strangeris', by 1466 a rate of 3/- on a barrel of salmon was substituted and, by a decree of February 1480-1, the duty was raised to the level of 4/- a barrel.[45] Salmon was normally packed in barrels of the Hamburg measure and an act of 1478 ensured the uniformity of its use as against all other containers.[46] Also in the 1466 custumars' accounts it was stated that a future levy of 18d would be charged on the export of a barrel of grilse or young salmon.[47] Statutory

---

40. APS, i, 504.
41. ER, ix, LXX. One last was calculated at twenty four dacres of hides.
42. See Appendix No.B/5(a) ER, iv, CLLlX.
43. APS, ii, 6.
44. SRO, Exchequer. Customs (Papers and Accounts), No.2
45. APS, ii, 8. ER, vii, 430, ix, 148. Twelve barrels made up one last.
46. APS, ii, 119.
47. ER, vii, 430.

attempts were made to control the indiscriminate slaughter of the salmon population. In 1503-4 the severe penalty of death on the third conviction was to be enforced on those found guilty of 'the slauchter of red fische in forbodin tyme' of the slaying of 'smoltis in mylne dammes clouse and be nettis thornis and cruvis' while special privileges of exemption from these enactments were to be reconsidered in the light of the 'comon wele'.[48] However, the practical effect of such legislation would probably have been extremely limited. Customs duties were also levied on the exportation of other types of fish, for instance in 1424 the king was entitled to extract custom at the following rate 'of ilk thousande of fresche hering sauld of the sellar jd, And of ilk last of hering takin be scottis men and barellyt iiijs, and of ilk last tane be strangeris vjs, And of ilk thousande rede hering maide in the realme iiijs'.[49] However, by the reign of James III, the 1424 customs rates on various types of herring seems to have fallen into disuse, for in the 1482 account of North Berwick, the duty on herring was quoted as 1/- a barrel under the terms of a royal proclamation.[50]

In 1425 a custom of 2/- in the pound was imposed on the export of manufactured cloth, which remained unaltered during the fifteenth century.[51] Cloth exported from Scotland was cheap in price and rough in texture. In order to arrive at the custom payable on a consignment of cloth, the custumar was required to calculate both the quantity and the value of the cloth in question. In 1462 a pack of cloth belonging to Matthew Forrester was transmitted to the ship without paying any custom since Forrester had refused to accept the custumar of Stirling's valuation of the cloth.[52] It was not uncommon for cloths to be assessed 'at various prices',[53] presumably

---

48. APS, ii, 11, 33, 51, 251. For the first offence a £10 was imposed, for the second a £20 fine and for the third, the criminal lost his life.
49. APS, ii, 6.
50. ER, ix, 197. Through ignorance, the custumars charged only 6d a barrell.
51. APS, ii, 8.
52. ER, vii, 219.
53. ER, x, 361, 609.

according to qualtiy. Prince variations obviously affected the total customs returns from each individual burgh within a given year. In 1490, for instance, the custom rate on a dozen ells of cloth fluctuated considerably from burgh to burgh, the cloth customed at Stirling was calculated at the rate of 2/- for every dozen ells, at Perth at 1/8, at Edinburgh at 1/2, at Ayr at 1/- and at Kinghorn at 8d.[54] In the Haddington customs books for 1504, the price of cloth was stated to be 24/- for a dozen ells of cloth, which yielded a customs duty of roughly 2/5 for each dozen ells of cloth.[55] However during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the custumars of Edinburgh seem to have calculated the rate of custom on exported cloth at exactly 1/- on every dozen ells of cloth.[56] Such a system of assessment left itself open to fraud on a large scale. In 1502 the custumar of Ayr was allowed £7-18-6 out of a gross total of £23-15-6 for the custom on lcoth which, he asserted, he had not received and, as a result, a notice was added to his entry ordering the custumar in future to raise the custom on the value of cloth accoring to the rate specified in the Acts of Parliament.[57] Also, since the onus for the calculation of the extent and value of the cloth rested with the custumar, collusion between the latter and the exported was a likely bent.

A variety of other, less important, exports were assessed for the payment of custom. For instance, the rate for salt was fixed at 1/- a chalder, coal at 1/4 for the same quantity, oil at 3/- a barrel, pitch and tar at 1/- a barrel and suet at 5/- a barrel.[58] Generally the custom on these goods amounted to a very little, although in 1510 a total of £57 was collected from the customs levy on the export of suet from the burghs of

---

54. ER, x, 227-240.
55. SRO, Customs Books, E 71/16/1. ER, xii, 259.
56. ER, x, 612, xii, 162, 262. In the customs accounts the cloth figures were calculated in the long hundred.
57. ER, xii, 79.
58. See Appendix No.B/5(a).These rates were in operation in 1513.

Linlithgow, Drundee, Stirling and Edinburgh.[59] In 1424 an 'ad valorem' duty of 1/- on every pound worth of horses, sheep and cattle bought in Scotland and exported.[60] In 1429-30 and 1431 sir Thomas Kirkpatrick and Michael Ramsey accounted as custumars of goods and livestock, transported into England. Between May 1429 and April 1431 a total of £61-16-1d was collected from this source.[61] In addition, in the latter year David Hume accounted for £4-10/- for the custom of goods and cattle exported to England through the east march.[62] Also a duty was placed on the exportation of gold and silver in order to discourage its export.[63] Until 1597 customs were levied mainly on exported goods, but, during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, an 'ad valorem' duty of 2/6 in the pound was levied on goods imported from England.[64] The levy was submitted both in cash and in kind.

Throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the burden of customs payments must have become increasingly less onerous as the years progressed. In the first place, the Scottish crown appears to have been extremely reluctant to raise customs rate on exports, perhaps in order not to alienate the fiscal support offered to the crown by the burgess community. Also, the gradual debasement of the Scottish coinage during the fifteenth century must have eased the effect of the existing customs levies. However in 1434 and 1435 customs continued to be paid in the old coinage and not in the new, debased currency.[65]

However, in the first decade of the sixteenth century, the crown attempted to arrest the declining customs returns with the introduction of'

---

59. ER, xiii, 362, 363, 364, 370.
60. APS, ii, 6.
61. ER, iv, 516. 527.
62. ER, iv, 527.
63. For details, see the chapter on the question of the money.
64. Lythe, the Economy of Scotland, 82-3. APS, ii, 8.
65. ER, iv, 554-629.

leasing. Leasing out the customs of a particular burgh may have been an attempt on the part of the crown to counteract evasion, for, since the lessee accounted for a fixed annual levy the latter was encouraged to ensure the efficient collection of the customs in order to avoid incurring a heavy loss in the arrangement. In most cases, these leases were received by the original custumars.[66] There were attempts during the reign of James III to lease the great customs. Between 1464 and 1466 Andrew Crawford and George Pennycuke the cloth custumars of Edinburgh, were each leased half the customs on cloth exports for and annual 'reddendo' of £66-13-4, but the experiment only endured for 2 years. As the total custom return for cloth in the following twelve months only amounted to £9-11/-, the unecomonical nature of the arrangement undoubtedly contributed to its transience.[67] In most cases the 'reddendo' attached to the lease was in excess of the gross annual customs returns for the years immediately prior to the grant. Of the eight burghs whose customs were leased in the early sisteenth century, only at Dysart was the average annual gross custom at £29 in excess of the lease 'reddendo' of £20.[68] Of the remainder, it would appear that leasing represented an attempt to boost royal income from the customs, for the 'reddendo' attached to the burghs of Haddington (£120), Kirkcudbright and Wigtown (£100), Perth (£140) and Cupar (£24) proved to be considerably higher than the preceeding average annual returns of £88, £29, £97 and £13 respectively.[69]

---

66. ER, xii, 368, 369, 468, 474. Until 5 July 1505 William McLellan of Bomby accounted for the various customs due from the burghs of Kirkcudbright and Wigtown, but from 30 September he accounted as lessee of the customs, rendering to the crown an annual farm of £100.

67. ER, vii, 502-3.

68. ER, xii, 84, 159, 267, 369, 468.

69. See Appendix No.B/5 (d)

In 1508 commissioners appointed for the leasing of the earldom of Moray were ordered to lease the customs within the earldom 'to quhat persouns thai think expedient for the Kingis proffit'.[70] In reponse to these sentiments, Andrew, bishop of Moray replaced Andrew Ayton as lessee of the customs of royal burghs within Moray, Ross and Caithness, which concession was gifted for life.[71] However, the experiment of leasing the great customs in several of the Scottish burghs failed to become an established practice, probably because the annual farm was set at too high a level and consequently reducing the attraction of the investment. This lack of demand was reflected in the fact that of the eight burghs whose customs were leased during the first decade of the sixteenth century, five returned to the traditional method of accounting by 1513.[72] In 1408 the customs of Linlithgow were leased to Robert Danielson for £33-6-8 annually but the arrangement only seems to have lasted for just over a year.[73] Since custumars had been appointed to collect the custom of individual exports like cloth and salmon, there are examples of leasing the custom derived from a specific commodity. On 28 January 1506-7, Alexander Elphinstone was granted the lease of the custom on salmon and other fish within the burgh and sheriffdom of Aberdeen for five years at an annual farm of £100.[74] Many of these leases were granted for five years or longer bur some failed to complete the term allotted.[75] The above grant to Elphinstone was conceded for five years but by July 1509 the lease had been transferred to Gilbert Menzies,[76] and although Andrew Mathieson and Patrick Kincraigie

---

70. RSS, i, 1734.
71. ER, xiii, 91, 233.
72. See Appendix No.B/5 (d)
73. ER, xiii, 227, 362. It appears that Danielson continued to be responsible for the customs until 12 March 1509-10 and was summoned for not accounting for the collection from 19 June 1509 to that date.
74. RSS, i, 1419. ER, xii, 600, xiii, 92, 237.
75. RSS, i, 1129, 1526, 1896. On 21 August 1507 the customs of Linlithgow were leased to John Inglis, marischal, for one year and afterwards at the kings pleasure.
76. RSS, i, 1419. ER, xiii, 372.

received a five year lease of the customs of Perth on 17 June 1509 the concession appears to have remained a dead letter as, from 20 March 1509-10, William Chaip and David Whiteson accounted for the customs of Perth in the normal manner.[77] Any conclusions concerning the failure of leasing must, through lack of evidence, be confined to conjecture. As an investment, the customs lease does not seem to have provided the grantee with sufficient return, reflected not only in the transience of the contracts but also in the average gross returns before and after these experiments. It is possible that the crown was too greedy and priced itself out of the market.

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the royal burgh of Berwick tended to dominate Scotland's mercantile and commercial business, but from the end of the latter century Berwick's propsperity began to wane and during the reign of David II the burgh was lost completely to the English. The vacuum left by the decline of Berwick was filled by Edinburgh, whose position on the firth of Forth and close proximity to England, proved ideal assets. By the late fourteenth century the burgh of Edinburgh had attained a position of commercial dominance in Scotland, a position which was further consolidated during the course of the fifteenth century with the decline of the neighbouring royal burghs of Linlithgow, Haddington, Dunbar and Inverkeithing.[78] In the late fifteenth century, the gross customs returns from the burgh of Edinburgh amounted to at lease five times that of the next burgh, Aberdeen, and in excess of the gross receipt from all the other Scottish burghs. In fact, Edinburgh retained a dominant position with the majority of Scottish exports, namely wool, pelts, hides, cloth and most of the lesser items. Although considerable quantities of fish were exported through the burgh of Edinburgh the latter did not retain the same monopoly over than commodity. The prosperity of the burghs of Aberdeen, Montrose, Pittenweem, Perth, Ayr, Banff, Dundee and Dumbarton was larely dependant on

---

77. RSS, i, 1896. ER, xiii, 370-1.

78. See Appendix No.B/5 (c)

on fish exports. Between 1502 and 1506 the gross annual average customs returns on the exportation of salmon, herring, cod and other fish amounted to £68 at Aberdeen, £50 at Edinburgh, £46 at Dumbarton, £27 at Montrose, £25 at Pittenweem and £16 at Dundee.[79] In addition, apart from isolated entries, most of the salt exports from Scotland were recorded at either Edinburgy or Dysart, Between April 1485 and July 1486 John Wynde, custumar of Dysart accounted for £62-15/- the custom on the export of 527 chalders, 8 bolls of salt.[80]

Although there was little attempt at increasing the customs rates on the part of the crown during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the promulgation of levies on hitherto uncustomed exportes and imports during the first two years of the reign of James I cushioned the decline in customs returns in late Mediaeval Scotland. The result was that, during the fifteenth century, certain burghs made a greater contribution to gross customs totals, namely Aberdeen and Dundee in the North East, Dysart, Crail, Pittenweem and Cuper in Fife, and Dumbarton and Ayr in the South West. Most of the major royal burghs accounted regularly to the Exchequer for their customs, but many of the smaller and more remote burghs tended to be more lax in their attendance. Even in the last few years of the reign of Jamex IV, there were no recorded customs accounts from the burghs of Drumfries, Dunbar Banff, Kinghorn, and Arbroath, while the Northern royal burghs of Elgin, Inverness, Forres, Banff tended to account only at irregular intervals. In 1445, for instance, Andrew Reid, custumar of Inverness, appeared at the Exchequer to account for the previous nine years.[81] Attempts at fining custumars who failed to appear at the Exchequer on the appointed day proved largely unsuccessful, for although six custumars were fined £10 each in 1501, they were either partly or wholly remitted.[82]

---

79. ER, xii, 78-474.
80. ER, ix, 422.
81. ER, v, 191.
82. ER, xi, 364-373.

Control over the export trade of late Mediaeval Scotland was exercised exclusively by the royal burghs and certain burghs of regality like St.Andrews, Glasgow and Dunfermline. The spirit of Mediaeval commercial activity was not one of free competition but more one of monopolistic conservatism and restriction, designed to preserve the existing areas of privilege from external encroachment. The royal burgh was not only the centre of trade and manufacture, it was the only permitted centre since it retained official monopoly over the right to participate in foreign trade and the privilege of brewing ale or making cloth. Restrictiveness pervaded all avenues of burghal activity, not only in the realm of business but also in the organization of burgh life, for the ruling burgess elite controlled the local courts and markets, exercised their will over the artisan and labouring classes resident within the burgh confines, retained a permanent monopoly over the principal offices in burghal government and effectively closed their ranks to outsiders.[83] Burghal authorities were frequently active in defending their privileges both within the burgh itself and also without against outside intrusion. Within the royal burgh itself the emphasis was on equality of opportuinity for members of the ruling burgess class. Non burgesses were forbidden to make purchases from foreign merchants until the burgesses had first conducted their business and not infrequently the burghal authorities would arrange a 'common bargain' whereby goods werebought in bulk which transaction the burgess class alone had the right to participate.[84] The location, time and condition of commercial activity within the burgh was recorded in detail and attempts at forestalling the regrating was strictly forbidden.[85] Also foreign merchants

---

83. For details of the organization of royal burghs in Scotland, see McKenzie, The Scottish Burgh.

84. Grant, The Social and Economic Development of Scotland before 1603, 366-8. McKenzie, The Scottish Burgh, 62-5.

85. Ibid, 63. APS, ii, 36. RSS, i, 1568. Forestalling represented the attempt to purchase articles before they had reached the market in order to evade the payment of tolls and to corner supplies. Regrating was the hoarding of supplies in expectation of dearth.

were permitted only to buy and sell commodities with free burgesses.[86] The jurisdiction of the royal burgh's monopoly of trade included not only the confines of the actual burgh but also the neighbouring countryside outside the burgh, which frequently involved the entire shire. Violations of the monopoly of the royal burghs were resisted with great vigour. For instance, in 1506 the royal burgh of Montrose complained that excessive damage was being inflicted through the export of wool, pelts, hides, salmon and cod from the towns of Stonehaven and Gourdon and also through the daily marketing of these articles at the churches of Fordoun, Fetteresso and Fettercairn, which towns were inside the 'privilege' of the royal burgh. Since the burgesses of Montrose stressed that his leakage was not only contrary to the liberties of the burgh but also resulted in the effective defrauding of royal customs, the king was encouraged to grant the aldermen, baillies and burgess of Montrose the power to seize the goods as escheat, retaining one half as reward, the remainder to be submitted to the Exchequer.[87] In order to prevent the drain of potential revenue through the clandestine commercial activities of the unfree trader, in 1458 James II empowered the provosts, baillies and burgesses of Aberdeen to escheat all goods exported within the sheriffdom without payment of the great customs.[88] The illicit actions of these unfree traders obviously continued unchecked since such powers were regranted in 1495 and against in 1511.[89] Because such illegal mercantiles activities were not subjected to the payment of royal customs, it was as much in the interests of the king as the burgh whose privileges were being contravened to stamp out these tendancies. In addition, on 7 April 1503 James IV directed the sheriff of Wigtown and the aldermen and ballies of the burgh of Wigtown to ensure that 'chepmen and al utheris' who

---

86. APS, ii, 86, 245.

87. RMS, ii, 3017.

88. Charters and Other Writs illustrating the History of Aberdeen, 29-30

89. Ibid. 36-40. RMS, ii, 3628.

took it upon themselves 'to by, sel nor regret in ony wise walx, irne, ter, fustiane, braid claith or a narow, salt, wyne, hide, woll, skyn, martis and victalis' were subjected to the penalty of escheat.[90] From these examples it is obvious that the king actively encouraged the mercantile monopoly as exercised by the royal burghs of Scotland since, by concentrating foreign trade, on which royal customs were due, in a few selected centres, it facilitated the collection of these levies. Other wise the raising of customs dues would have proved an impossible task had licence to import and export foreign commodities been scattered throughout Scotland.

However, the exact trading jurisdiction of several royal burghs was frequently ill defined and open to rival claims. In 1402 the burghs of Dundee and Perth quarrelled over the freedom of loading and unloading vessels in the Tay,[91] while the former was also engaged in a extended dispute with the burgh of Montrose over the extent of their respective trading privileges. In 1458 the king's council ordained that each burgh was to trade within the bounds cited in their charters with Dundee retaining the right to pursue all forestallers within the shire of Forfar, but in 1462 the question still remained unresolved when the king granted a writ to settle the dispute.[92] The burghs of Ayr and Irvine clashed over their shares of the sheriffdom until it was established that the latter's privileges extended over the baronies of Cunningham and Largs as stated in the original charter of 1372.[93] The royal burgh of Inverness, whose jurisdiction extended to the entire countryside north of the burgh, objected strongly to the intrusion of such townships as Tain, summoned before the lords of the Council for usurping the freedom and privileges of the burgh of Inverness 'in buying of skynnis, hydis, salmond, yrne and uthir merchandise

---

90. RSS, i, 927.

91. The Charters of Dundee, 18

92. RMS, ii, 139-140. Hist. MSS. Comm., 2nd Report, 205-6.

93. Muniments of the Royal Burgh of Irvine, i, 12-3, 42-3, RMS, i, 398.

that suld cum to the mercat of Invernes and sellis the samyn to strangeris, or hes thame furth of the realme uncustuyt'.[94] Secondly the royal burghs must have looked with considerable disfavour at the sprouting of baronial burghs in the late fifteenth century. During the reign of James IV a total of twenty four such burghs were created, permitted to hold fairs and markets although not allowed to engage in foreign trade.[95] One of the overriding features of the late Mediaeval royal burgh, both in Scotland and in the rest of Europe, was this continuous undercurrent of jealousy. Most of the royal burghs reacted violently against any interference and attach on their liberties, they attracted an invaluable ally in the crown, whose sole desire was to ensure the efficient collection of the revenue derived from the great customs.

The main bulk of Scotland's commercial activity was concentrated on the east coast ports of Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Dundee and was directed mainly towards the Low Countries and the Baltic regions, although the latter was frequently affected by the continual struggle between the Hanseatic League, Denmark and Holland for control over the avenues of trade. However, the principal entrepot for Scottish trade was undoubtedly the Low Countries, for, before the wars of Independance, Scottish merchants had been accorded centrain freedomes and privileges to encourage this connection.[96] During the fifteenth century Scots merchants succeeded in establishing a staple in the Low Countries, an arrangement whereby the port concerned granted merchants from Scotland certain commercial privileges and immunites in return for a monopoly of their trade. The desire for greater privileges and occasional reprisals for commercial misdemeanours encouraged Scottish merchants to sell their trade for the best cnnditions. Although Scottish trade was small in

---

94. ADC, ii, 487. For further details of such clashes, Keith, 'Trading Privileges of Royal Burghs of Scotland'. EHR, XXVIII, 461-5.

95. Mackie, King James IV of Scotland, 138-9

96. Davidson and Gray, The Scottish Staple at Veere, 114.

comparison with England and many other commercial nations, the evidence suggests that the port of Bruges (until its decline in the fifteenth century)[97] Campveere, Antwerp and Middleburgh vied with one another for the establishment of the Scottish staple. The Letters of James IV revealed the extent of the correspondance between Scotland and these cities and also the latters' willingness to make concessions to attract Scottish merchants.[98] The extent of such competition can be assessed by the fact that in 1508 the city of Middleburg offerred James IV a gift of 300 gold crowns if the Scottish staple was established at that port.[99] In order to protect the interests of the Scottish trader in these foreign commercial centres a resident conservator was appointed by the crown and in 1504 his powers were defined as giving him the power to settle differences between Scottish merchants with the aid of four or six 'honest merchants' and he was also charged with supervising the interests and property of Scottish merchants in these ports.[100] The staple operated under certain conditions. For example the class exclusiveness of permitted Scottish traders was maintained. An Act of Parliament of 1487 stated that 'na man sale in the saidis partis (namely Flanders, Holland and Zeeland) in the way of merchandice bot famous and woreschipfull men haifand likane of ther awne half a last of gudis or samekle in sterage'.[101] In theory, the establishment of the Scottish staple at a particular port in the Low Countries presupposed a monopoly of that trade to the city concerned. In 1466 an Act of Parliament granted Scottish merchants a licence to trade at the port of Middleburg and native merchants were forbidden to transport merchandise to 'the swyn, the sluse, the dam or

---

97. For details of the commercial entrepot at Bruges, see Van Houtte, 'The Bruges Market'. ECHR, 2nd series, XIX, 29-47.

98. The Letters of James IV, Scot. Hist. Soc.,

Antwerp	Letter No.	28
Middleburg	" "	29, 78, 129, 188.
Veere	" "	130,164, 165. (The latter led to the establishment of a temporary staple at Veere for two years).

99. Ibid., Letter No.188

100. Davidson and Gray, The Scottish Staple at Veere, 134. APS, ii, 252.

101. APS, ii, 178.

Bruges' under pain of escheat.[102] However, although the idea of a staple implied a rigid exclusiveness of trading venue, the evidence suggests that that Scottish merchants were eager to retain a certain degree of liberty in transacting business with ports other than the official staple port. During the fifteenth century there was a large overturn of staple venues and it would have been unrealistic to have expected Scottish traders to have arbitrarily alternated their centres of business every few years. In 1456, while the staple was fixed at Middleburg, the records of the burgh of Aberdeen recorded theappointment of Laurence Pomstrat at 'host and receiver' of Scottish merchants at Flushing where there was at least some mercantile connection with Scotland.[103]

Trade with other commercial centres tended to be of considerably less significance than that with the Low Countries . With the decline in the commercial power of the Hanseatic League in the fifteenth century, the east coast ports of Aberdeen and Dundee made inroads into the Baltic market, for, between 1474 and 1476, twenty four Scottish vessels entered the port of Danzig.[104] In addition, a certain proportion of Scottish trade was destined for England and France mainly from the west coast ports of Ayr and Dumbarton.

As mentioned before, the second half of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnesses a substantial decline in Scotland's export trade. The decline was fairly continuous with brief spells of recovery during the reign of James I and the latter part of that of James IV.[105] Conversly, during the reign of James IV there appears to have been a boom in the quantity and variety of articles being imported into Scotland. The accounts of king's

---

102. APS, ii, 87.

103. Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Aberdeen, i, 21.

104. Davidson and Gray, The Scottish Staple at Veere, 107.

105. See Appendix No.B/5 (e)

treasurer and the ledger of Andrew Haliburton, which recorded the commercial dealings of this merchant, the conservator based in Middleburg for the period 1490 to 1500, revealed the extent and nature of Scotland's import trade. Both the crown and private individuals seem to have possessed sufficient resources to invest in the purchase of a vast variety of foreign commodities. The accounts of the treasurer recorded the allowance of large sums of revenue for the purchase of iron, wood, wine, a variety of expensive cloths, silks and furs, and other luxury items.[106] Haliburton's ledger revealed an extensive business in the private importation of an immense variety of essential and luxury items, too numerous to mention in detail, not only by merchants but also by other ranks of society.[107]

In the staple town, the conservator was employed by many merchants and others with business in the Low Countries as a convenient agent through whom commercial and financial affairs were conducted. The ledger of Andrew Haliburton recorded the extent and nature of these arrangements. Several merchants from the principal burghs of Scotland sent quantities of money and merchandise to pay for large consignments of imports purchased on their behalf by the conservator. In the account of John Peterson, between February and April 1494, he transmitted £23-2-8 (in calculated Flemish groats) in a variety of coins to the conservator and five sacks of wool, which were sold in Middleburg for £112-17-11 Flemish.[108] As with all other factors, Haliburton received a fee for his efforts, for in May 1499 John Anderson of Aberdeen submitted £2-16/- to Haliburton 'for my seruis of the 5 stekis'.[109] Imports tended to be of the luxury type too numerous to

---

106. TA, i-iv. (for details of purchases), also see the chapter on the Treasurer's Discharge.

107. Ledger of Andrew Haliburton, XXXIV-XLIII. The ledger recorded Haliburton's commercial dealings with the duke of Ross, the Archbishop of St.Andrews, the bishop of Aberdeen and the abbot of Holyrood.

108. The Ledger of Andrew Haliburton, 36.

109. Ibid., 230.

mention but the most common cargoes contained a variety of spices, drugs, alum, fine cloth, silk, fruit, wine, velvet and a variety of ornaments. As well as native merchants the accounts of Haliburton revealed that several foreign traders, Hector and Peter van Artryk, Bodyn de Graff, Francis Amand and Amand de Bellaw, participated in Scottish trading circles.[110]

Although the late fifteenth century witnessed a substantial increase in the commercial activities of the Scottish mercantile community, their wealth and ability to trade was not based entirely on the profits derived from the export trade. In fact, the export trade did not yeild entensive profits, for, even in England, a wool merchant probably derived no more than £2 clear profit on every sack of wool.[111] Also in the later middle ages legitimate trading between Scotland and the Low Countries was constantly exposed to the exports of English and other privateers, over which there was little control.[112] There was, however, a rising mercantile middle class in late Mediaeval Scotland, of which Robert Barton of Leith was a prime example.[113] His accumulation of wealth was based not so much on the export trade, but more on the risky, but much more lucrative, investment in private debts, often of fairly substantial landowners, and privateering. Concerning the latter, the overall augmentation of international trade in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and the uncertainty of maritime law, facilitated the spread of such activities. Letters of marque, issued by various governments, including that of James IV, provided privateering with a cloak of respectability.[114] Although Robert Barton continued to engage in legitimate trading, the prospect of

---

110. For details of imports, see Ledger of Andrew Haliburton.
111. Power and Postan, English Trade in the Fifteenth Century, 71.
112. Van Houtte, 'The Bruges Market'. ECHR, 2nd series, XiX, 315.
113. For details of his career, see Reid, Skipper from Leith.
114. Letter of James IV, Scot. Hist., Soc., Letter Nos.206-8. James III had issued letters of marque to the Bartons to avenge the alleged plundering of John Barton's ship by the Portuguese. Similar letters were periodically issued by James IV.
Extracts from the Records of Burgh of Edinburgh, 119-20

large windfalls from money lending and privateering proved to be more attractive than the former, which, although a safer type of enterprise, was still subject to the effects of weather, pirates and reprisals.

Commodities bound for export were customed before loading and in order to show that all the customs had been levied, a cocket was issued and authenticated by the seal of the appropriate burgh.[115] At the annual Exchequer, all custumars (excluding lessees of burgh customs) wer required to produce their customs books which included a detailed statement of all the goods customed. In 1491 Thomas Inglis, custumar of Pittenweem, was charged with the customs collected from the export of herring, cod, hides and English cloth, but he was unable to provide details of the amount of lasts or barrels involved 'through ignorance'.[116] As presented to the Exchequer, the custom's books and the cocket clerk's books furnished no more than the name of the exporter and the amount of goods for which customs were payable, but no reference as to the extent of the duties collected.[117] These two books were almost identical in format and served as a check on possible fraud. In order to calculate the amount of custom owed the Exchequer clerks worked out the total gross customs due for each commodity by adding up the various figures on each page of these books and only the total custom payable on each commodity was recorded in the rolls. The books of entries of ships recorded the cargo transported by each vessel, the date of entry, the name of the ship, its master and its destination.[118] If no goods had been customed during the year of the account the custumar stated that fact under oath,[119] otherwise he produced the customs book and clerk of the cocket's book so that the gross custom levy could be assessed.

---

115. In 1444, £2 was allowed to the custumar of Dumbarton for a new cocket seal. ER, v, 146.

116. ER, x, 303.

117. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E 71/16/1. ER, xii, 259.

118. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E 71/29/2. The Aberdeen books seem to have been a mixture of both the entry book and the customs book with lists of commodities and details concerning ships combined together (SRO. Exchequer Customs Books, E 71/1/1)

119. ER, ix, 438.

These various documents relating to the great customs provided a useful insight into some aspects of Scottish commercial life. It would seem that there was a constant flow of merchant ships entering and leaving the principal Scottish ports. At Leith, between September 1510 and May 1511 and again between October 1512 and June 1513 a total of twenty eight vessels departed from the port at each period and during the year 1499-1500, fifteen vessels left the port of Aberdeen with Scottish exports.[120] Some vessels appear to have made more than one voyage during the year since a ship of Alexander Rough was entered at the port of Leith on 8 December 1512, 12 April and 9 June 1513.[121] Firstly, it would appear that a large portion of Scotland's export trade was transported abroad in foreign vessels. On 20 July 1499 5 lasts, 4 barrels of salmon were exported from the port of Aberdeen 'interyt in a schip of Ingland callyt the Payll of Hummer the master onder God callyt Jhone Byllenghem', who was also the owner of the salmon.[122] As well and English vessels, a large proportion of Scottish exports were shipped abroad in continental boats, for, of the fifteen ships wich transported wool from Aberdeen, nine originated from Veere, three from Dieppe two from Lubeck and one was identified as John of Callatt's ship.[123] Native shipping seems to have played a minor role in Scotland' commercial activities although the list of shipping entries from Leith between October 1512 and June 1513 recorded the employment of vessels belonging to Scotsmen, Robert Barton, John Lawson and Thomas Chalmers, as well as the use of the King's bark.[124] In fact, certain foreign merchant-skippers seem to have made considerable inroads into Scottish mercantile operations. One such person was William Gilot, a Frenchman, who not only profitted from the shipment of

---

120. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E71/1/1, E71/29/2,3.

121. IBID, E71/29/3.

122. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E71/1/1.

123. Ibid, E71/1/1.

124. Ibid, E71/29/3.

Scottish exports to the Continent, but also was hired to transport items purchased abraod to Scotland.[125] It seems certain that native shipping was insufficient to handle the volume of Scotland's export and import trade, the bulk of which was transported in foreign vessels.[126] Indeed, in England it was only in the early sixteenth century that there was a substantial rise in the volume and activity of native shipping in the overseas trade as compared with the small merchant navy of the mid fifteenth century. Scammell maintained that 'the rise of an English merchant fleet was largely the corollary of that emergance of a native, merchant class which marked the later Middle Ages' although, in Scotland, the overall lack of the latter must have severely curtailed the development of the former.[127] A major part of Scottish merchant craft was probably engaged only in internal trade, transporting goods from one Scottish port to another.

Secondly, from the nature of the entries in the customs books, it is obvious that most Scottish merchants tended to spread the risk by exporting only small consignments of goods in separate ships. Concerning the wool export from Aberdeen from 1499 to 1500, Thomas Black exported a total of 15 sacks, 8 stone in eight consignments.[128] Also the majority of Scottish merchants tended not to concentrate in one single commodity in case the market proved temporarily unfavourable, but instead investerd in a variety of articles. During the year 1512-13 Master John Murray was recorded in the entries of ships at Leith as having exported 10 sacks, 3 stones of wool, 27 dacres of hides, 3 stones of pelts, 1 'puncheon' of tar, 9½ lasts of herring, 14 barrels of salmon, 1 barrle of flesh and 400 cod in seventeen separate consignments.[129]

---

125. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books E 71/29/3. TA, iv, 290.
126. The Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer revealed that a large portion of goods imported into Scotland were carried in alien craft. TA, iv, 288-9, 296-7, 301, 302.
127. Scammell, 'Shipowning in England,' Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, xii, 117.
128. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E 71/1/1.
129. Ibid, E71/29/3.

Thirdly, the lists of exporters of Scottish raw materials, as detailed in the various customs records, revealed that, although a large portion of Scottish commercial activity was performed by members of the mercantile community, they by no means retained a monopoly. It was not uncommon for members of the first two estates to engage in trade. There was no similar social stigma attached to magnatial or ecclesiastical participation in commercial activity as that which had existed in France. However, members of the first and second estates did not participate personally in commercial ventures, but acted through the agency of the mercantile community. On 24 August, for instance, William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, exported 4 lasts of salmon from the port of Aberdeen in a Berwick ship called the 'Harry'.[130] Remissions of custom duties which were recorded in the discharge side of the custumar's accounts, demonstrated the active participation of sections of the noble class in trading ventures, for, in 1508, James, earl of Arran was in receipt of customs remission of over £48 for the exportation from Edinburgh of 24 sacks of wool and 6 lasts and 4 hides belonging to him.[131] During the fifteenth century, the crown was constantly engaged in the export of various commodities, for which no custom was liable.[132] In 1485 the custumar of Edinburgh was allowed £4-10-8, the custom of 1 last, 14 dacre of hides belonging to the king and sold by John, lord Bothwell for Gascon wine while, in 1487, the same official was not charged with the custom on 4 lasts, 17 dacreof hides as they were the property of the crown and sold by the custumar to certain merchants.[133] The customs books revealed that James IV actively participated in Scotland's export trade. Between October 1512 and June 1513, 14 lasts, 4 barrels of

---

130. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E71/1/1.

131. ER, xiii, 97.

132. ER, iv, 528, 535, 573, 613, vi, 5, 119, 491, 497, vii, 33, 147, 500 589, viii, 191.

133. ER, ix, 344, 547.

salmon, 6 chalders of coal, 12 barrels of tallow and 16 dacres of hides, belonging to the crown, were exported from the port of Leith through the agencies of Robert Barton, George Halkerstone and William Mure.[134] In addition, as well as native merchants, considerable quantities or wool, hides, pelts, fish and other rural products were purchased and exported by foreign merchants. In the lists of exports, as detailed in the various customs books, numerous exporters of alien extraction were catalogued, men like Richard Alan, Frenchman, John Billingham, an Englishman, Piers Cristall, John Getgud and several other.

Although a consignment of goods was levied for custom and received a cocket from a particular burgh, it was not uncommon for the merchandise in question to be shipped to another port for export. Such consignments were recorded in the book of entries of the port from which they were finally exported with the name of the original burgh inserted in the margin. Since the owner of such goods was able to produce a cocket proving that he had already submitted a customs levy, these commodities were not recorded in customs books or the cocket books of the port where they were loaded for shipment. It seems to have been common practice for exports to congregate in the larger ports of Leith and Aberdeen, where shipping facilities were more readily available. The books of entries for the port of Leith recorded the loading of cargoes originally customed at Banff, Elgin, Dunfermline, Tain, Crail and Arbroath.[135] Normally the customs levied on such re-exports was only recorded in the accounts of the original burgh, but occasionally these entries appeared in the charge side of both custumars' accounts. In 1457 the custumars of Perth were allowed 13/4 of the custom on pelts since, although they had been loaded at Perth, they had been customed at Kinghorn whose custumars were responsible for the revenue.[136] The presentation of

---

134. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E 71/29/3.

135. SRO, Exchequer, Customs Books, E 71/29/2.

136. ER, vi, 299.

a cocket from the port of origin released the custumar at the port of loading, from any liability for the customs on the delivery of the same cochet to the annual exchequer. This served as a cross check on the honesty and efficiency of both custumars. Although the custumars of the burghs of Edinburgh, Linlithgow and Haddington were charged with the custom on various commodities, because of their geographical position, the goods, on receipt of the cocket were transported to the ports of Leith, Blackness and Aberlady respectively for loading.[137] In addition, the custumar received an allowance for the custom on goods which were not in fact exported but sold within the realm. In 1469 the custumar of Cupar received such an allowance for the custom on 43 dozen of cloth since the merchant involved maintained 'under oath' that the goods had been sold within Scotland and not exported.[138]

Although the crown seems to have made little attempt to augment the royal revenue accruing from the great customs, considerable efforts were made to halt the constant loss of income through customs evasion and smuggling. It is likely that the export figures recorded in the customs accounts represented only a fraction of the goods which actually departed from Scotland. Apart from the exports from which no custom was due, there was a considerable volume of illicit trading in late Mediaeval Scotland.

Smuggling and customs evasion was especially rife during the captivity of Jame I and the minority of his son, James II. In 1409 the custumars of Edinburgh were unable to collect the custom on twenty three sacks of wool belonging to seven exporters.[139] In 1413 the same custumars failed to collect any custom on forty two serplars of wool belonging to the earl of Douglas, concerning which four serplars were estimated as equivalent to five sacks, since Adam Liddall had exported them in the earl's name without

---

137. ER, iv, 2, 8, 17

138. ER, vii, 586.

139. ER, iv, 78.

submitting any custom.[140] During the regency of the dukes of Albany, large cargoes bound for the Continent left the principal ports of Scotland 'uncustomed'. Although merchant burgesses proved to be the principal offenders, the desire to defraud the crown seems to have included all ranks of society, for, in 1417, the lord of Seaton was recorded as having expoxted a total of sixteen serplars or wool, two serplars, two sacks of pelts and ten dacres, five hides in various ships for which no custom had been paid,[141] and it was mentioned that Seaton and been engaged in similar activities for several years. Also, in 1416, the vicar of Musselburgh, called sir Bartholemew, refused to pay the appropriate customs on four sacks of wool.[142] The fuller impression of the loss of potential revenue to the crown through the non payment of customs on articles of export was recorded in the 1418 account of the custumars of Edinburgh, when the accountants were unable to collect any customs from 103 serplars, 7 sacks of wool, which had not even been weighed at the trone, 33 sacks, 7 stone of wool, which had been weighed but had not been assessed for customs, 10 dacre of hides and over 5 serplars of woolfells. Those involved in defying royal officials tended to be either members of powerful burges families, like David and William Towers, Alexander Napier and Gilbert Swift, or scions of influencial noble stock, the James Douglas, Robert Borthwick and John Livingstone, both groups possessing sufficient prestige and influence to overawe royal custumars.[143] On a smaller scal, similar activities were frequent occurances in smaller royal burghs, for, in 1418, the custumars of Linlithgow complained that 5 serplars of wool belonging to Archibald, master of Douglas had been weighed but no customs duty was forthcoming, while William Blackburn of Inverkeithing and John Burky exported at lease on last of hides in the ship of Henry van Mouster without paying any custom.[144]

---

140. ER, iv, 173.
141. ER, iv, 275.
142. ER, iv, 251.
143. See Appendix No. ER, iv, 300-1
144. ER, iv, 296.

Although these and many other similar incidents were reported to the Governor, little effective action was taken to halt these abuses.

However, with the return of James I from England in 1424, stringent efforts were enacted to clamp down on illicit commercial activity which had proved so detrimental to royal finances. Penalties for customs evasion were severe in order to discourage clandestine trading. In 1427-8 those persons convicted of exporting commodities without submitting the proper customs levy were to be banished.[145] Later records revealed that the full force of the law was being brought to bear on customs evaders. During the fifteenth century it seems to have been common practice for the crown to poind the goods of offenders who attempted to evade royal customs. In 1493 it was enacted that because of the 'defraude done to our soverane lord in his custumis be strangeris and alienaris of utheris realmes' through failure to pay custom on their merchandise, in future all such exports were not to be loaded on a vessel 'quhill it be sene be the custumaris and clerkis of the cocket quhat gudis and merchandice thai send to the sey and the custumis and dewteis payit therefor and the oist of the Innys quhair the saidis strangeris ar lugit sall answer to the king for thair custumis and dewteis gif the saidis strangeris passis away uncustumyt'.[146] In 1467, the custumar of Inverkeithing was ordered to distrain Robert Brown and his accomplices for the unpaid custom on cloth illicitly exported from Scotland by them to the financial detriment of the crown. The custumar was required either to procure an escheat of Robert's goods before the end of the present exchequer or else place Brown in a royal prison to ensure restitution.[147]

Although customs evasion continued throughout the fifteenth century, there is evidence of increased efficiency on the part of the royal officers in cutting down the losses to the crown. In 1493 Thomas Inglis, a former custumar of

---

145. APS, ii, 15.
146. APS, ii, 234.
147. ER, vii, 509.

Pittenweem, caused certain named persons to be summonded during the present Exchequer to answer for the illegal exportation of cod, herring, cloth, hides and other goods which were liable for customs and which had either been exported without submitting any customs duties or had been seen by the custumar without a cocket. The auditors upheld the crown's case and the defenders, found guilty of defrauding the crown, were ordered to pay £107-5-7 for the unpaid customs and also to enter their person in ward in Blackness castle at their own expense for the king's pleasure.[148] The account of the following year recorded that the convicted inhabitants of Pittenweem compounded with the comptroller for 1000 dried cod to be delivered to the king's household before All Saints Day 1494 in place of the fine.[149] In addition to the above penalties, a fine of £1 on every penny of unpaid customs was also in operation. In 1484 the custumars of Perth were not charged with an uncustomed pack of woollen cloth, exported by a certain John Halyman, and the former were required to imprison Halyman on his return to Scotland and confiscate his goods until he had submitted the penalty of £1 for every 1d of custom left unpaid.[150] Such procrastinations were not merely idle threats. In 1487 George Maxwell, custumar of Dumbarton and 'Lowis' received no custom from three ships belonging to William Joffray of Brittany, Nicholas Margaret of St.Maulo and Arnold of Gascony who departed Scotland with a quantity of herring for which they possessed no cocket. The auditors ordered the arrests of their persons, goods and vessels whenever they returned to Scotland and on the occasion of the latter being subsequently sighted at Ayr, the aldermen and baillies of that burgh were ordered to seize the hides and other goods left behind by Arnold as the king's escheat.[151]

---

148. ER, x, 381-2

149. ER, x, 456.

150. ER, ix, 290-1. In latin 'donec satisfecerit pro quolibet denario dicte custume unam libram secundum jura regni'

151. ER, ix, 543-4.

Collusion between royal custumars and various merchants seems to have been a common occurance and one which was extremely difficult to detect. However, in 1495 the custumar and clerk of the cocket at Haddington were discovered granting cockets for fourteen consignments of cloth and pelts without either receiving any customs or entering them in the customs books. On the revelation of this attempt at defrauding the crown, the officials were required to pay the customary penalty of £1 for every 1d of lost customs, which, since the sum of the customs lost to the crown had been calculated at £6, they became royal debtors for a total of £1,440, for which their goods and lands were to be distrained and they were to be entered in ward in Edinburgh castle until a schedule of payment had been formed.[152] Although those convicted of illicit trading were subject to extremely heavy penalties, as in the case of the inhabitants of Pittenweem, a certain degree of leniency was also entertained. Much of the onus for the recovery of lost customs rested with the custumars, who were required to bring the offenders to justice and to poind their goods and property for the outstanding sums. In 1487 George Maxwell, custumar of Dumbarton, received an allowance of £14-16/- for his 'great labours' and because he 'took the risk for the payment of the said three ships upon himself'.[153]

Attempts at defrauding the crown of its full customs levy were frequently recorded but what was probably more serious were the examples which escaped recognition in official records. Expecially in the more outlying burghs where the small and often irregular customs returns from Burghs like Inverness and Ayr undoubtedly reflected the effect of persistant efforts at evading customs payments. In areas where royal authority was not continually making its presence felt, fraud and smuggling were rife. In addition, it is likely that such underground arrangements were hidden in a

---

152. ER, x, 536-7. The goods exported illegally included 2 packs of cloth and 9 serplars, 4 packs of pelts.

153. ER, ix, 543.

cloak of official inefficiency and trade recessions. Ignorance and negligence were frequently employed as excuses for the failure to collect specific duties. In 1482 George Robinson, custumar of the cloth exports from Edinburgh, was charged with £100-8/- through estimation since the accountants rolls had been lost.[154] In 1482 the custumar of North Berwick received an allowance for 29/- on the custom on herring since he asserted that he received only 6d on each barrel 'through negligence', claiming that he was ignorant of the raising of the rate to 1/-.[155] The existance of false cockets,[156] omissions from the custumar's charge,[157] and allowances for overcharge [158] were avenues which undoubtedly hid the existance of fraud. The latter especially could be open to considerable abuse for, in 1466, David Menzies, custumar of Berwick, was allowed £13 as an overcharge of the custom levied on exported salmon since Menzies claimed that he was charged at the rate of 5/- a barrel instead of the official rate of 3/-.[159] Also in 1502 the custumar ofAyr was allowed an overcharge of £7-18-6 from the custom levied on cloth since he asserted that he had not received the cash involved and was ordered in future to raise the custom at the official 'ad valorem' rate of 2/- in the pound.[160] Obviously administrative confusion and insufficient or unclear instructions contributed to the uncertainty of the situation. For instance, in 1454 and 1455, the custumers of Perth were recorded as not being charges with any custom levied on exported almon and imported English goods but they were ordered, on the king's behalf, to compel William Fotheringham, alleged receiver of those particular commodities, to account at the Exchequer.[161] Several accountants excused

---

154. ER, ix, 202.
155. ER, ix, 197.
156. ER, x, 462.
157. ER, ix, 201, 212
158. ER, vii, 432, viii, 546.
159. ER, vii, 421.
160. ER, xii, 79.
161. ER, v, 626, vi, 21. There is no record of any account by Fotheringham subsequent to that statement.

their failure to collect certain customs by claiming that they had received no official mandate. In 1471 the custumar of Inverness, Peter Winchester, accounted only for the custom on hides, claiming that he had no mandate to collect the customs on any other commodities,[162] despite the fact a similar plee had been made by custumars Ewan Auchinleck and Donald Johnstone in 1464 and they were also ordered to raise the profit from other commodities in the future. Also, there were occasions when the Exchequer had no knowledge of the name and position of the person engaged in the collection of certain customs, as in the period from 12 July 1460 until the entry of James Lindsay as custumar of the burgh of Kirkcudbright in 20 July 1461 for an inquiry was set in motion in 1463 to ascertain the identity of the intromitter.[163] Many custumars revealed an obvious reluctance to render accounts, possibly since they had been engaged in illegal operations. William Lennox rendered an account for the customs of the burgh of Wigtown from 28 January 1475-6 to July 1476, but it would appear that Lennox had been appointed to the post before that date and not having submitted a prior account, was summoned to answer for the outstanding revenue.[164] Lack of custumable exports from the burgh was frequently employed as the reason behind the custumar's failure to render an account for one or more commodities. Because of the difficulties in checking and verifying such assertions, especially in the remoter burghs, it is probable that such statements served as a cover for fraudulent activities. In 1467, James Douglas, custumar of the burghs of Elgin and Forres, maintained that no custumable goods were exported from the latter burgh and also that no

---

162. ER, vii, 296, viii, 131.

163. ER, vii, 210.

164. ER, vii, 380. The threat of legal action seems to have encouraged William Lennox to settle with the crown, since in the margin, it was recorded that Thomas Simpson, the king's comptroller, had received an outstanding payment of £3 from Lennox although there is no way of ascertaining whether that submission represented a composition for a lower amount or full payment of the customs collected.

salmon was exported from the burgh of Elgin during the period of his account.[165] Unfortunately it is difficult to dig beneath the surface of the accounts, but it would seem that greater inroads were being made into the profit from royal customs through evasion, corruption and inefficiency above that recorded in the rolls.

However, losses were recorded for other, less sinister, causes. Between 1401 and 1404 no account was rendered for customs levied at Dunbar since no merchandise was loaded for export by reason of the unsettled border situation, at the same burgh in 1429 no custom was levied on woolfells and hides since these commodities remained in the burgh through a shortage of vessels to convey them abroad and between 3 July and 3 November 1500 the custumar of Aberdeen, Robert Menzies, had refused to enter the burgh to discharge his duties on account of the existance of plague.[166] Allowances tended to be made for exporters whose poverty and lack of distrainable goods[168] made collection impossible, although again this must have been open to abuse.

In 1488 the custumar of Kinghorn complained that Dugal Campbell, burgess of Edinburgh, had deforced him of the profit from over forty eight stones of wool,[169] while no account of the customs of Inverness was rendered between 8 July 1473 and 1 October 1475 since the custumar, Peter Winchester, had been killed in the execution of his office.[170] However unless the local custumars were backed by royal authority, the forces of corruption tended to retain the upper hand and this was undoubtedly the case in burghs distant from Edinburgh. The crown did adopt measures designed to halt this steady drain of royal resources. In order to clamp down on

---

165. ER, vii, 508.
166. ER, iv, 6, 466, xi, 265.
167. ER, v, 18. £22-7/- of the customs owed by Roger Williams was allowed to the custumar on account of Williams' poverty since he lost his goods in England.
168. ER, v, 439.
169. ER, x, 57
170. ER, ix, 392.

such expensive abuses as underweighing, periodic checks were made on the burgh trons. In 1412 William Towers received an allowance of £20 for work around the examination of various trons.[171] Although custumars were appointed as royal officers but it is by no means certain that they always acted to the benefit of the crown. It seems likely that many augmented their meagre fee by assisting illicit commercial activities. Those who resisted the forces of corruption frequently did so at their own risk. In 1493 Parilament authorized the appointment of searchers in order to detect infringements in the method of custuming merchandise.[172] On 15 October 1506 Robert Doby, burgess of Haddington and Robert Lawson were consititued 'sercharis, searis and settaris of al maner of skynnis, claith, and uthir gudis awand the king custum within the burgh' of Haddington.[173]

Revenue from the great customs was lost not only during the actual process of assessing merchandise for the payment of customs but also after the customs duties had actually been collected. During the regency of the two Albanys and to a lesser extent during the minority of James II, crown custumars were being continually cajoled and bullied into handing over large quantities of customs revenue to private individuals. This abuse was especially rife during the absence of James I, when neither duke Robert nor his son was in a position to counteract this trend. The position of Robert, duke of Albany as Governor during the captivity of the king in England was an extremely tenuous one, dependant largely on the goodwill, or at worst, the neutrality of the leading families of Scotland. In this uneasy position, Albany was not in a position to check this constant drain of resources and was compelled to overlook the wilful plundering of crown revenue by various baronial groups. In the case of the burghs of Edinburgh and Linlithgow, continuous, large scale plundering

---

171. ER, iv, 143.

172. APS, ii, 234.

173. RSS, i, 1345.

of the customs by the earl of Douglas was largely ignored by Albany as the price he had to pay for the indispensible political support of one of the most powerful magnate in Scotland. During the period under review, a total of £8,750 was seized from the customers of Edinburgh and Linlithgow by the earl or his associates, namely James Douglas, the second son of earl Archibald, sir William Crawford, constable of Edinburgh castle, his brother Robert Crawford, William Borthwick, captain of the castle, Archibald, master of Douglas and William Douglas of Drumlanrig.[174] This figure, a combination of evasion and direct theft, was a formidable total even by the standards of the early fifteenth century and there is every possibility that further unrecorded plunderings would have augmented the total to even greater heights. Even at the first audit after the death of Robert III, James Douglas was recorded as having violently uplifted £23-5-2 from the custumars of Edinburgh.[175] Thereafter the customs returns from Edinburgh and Linlithgow were constantly pillaged by Douglas and his associates. The extent of such activities tended to vary from year to year, in 1414, 1415, 1421, and 1422 the Douglas faction usurped £1,425-18-5, £1,536-11-6, £802-14-5 and £1,114-6/- respectively from the gross customs returns whereas between 1410 and 1412 only £43-11/- was lost from these accounts.[176] Although a certain proportion of the revenue seized by the earl of Douglas was stated to be in the form of recompense for public services, that explanation could hardly vindicate such wanton plundering. In 1416, for instance, the earl of Douglas was in receipt of £490 from the custumars of Edinburgh in return for the expenses incurred by Douglas at truce days and in border warfare, but the call for an official inquiry at the end of this entry suggested more sinister dealings.[177] Despite frequent calls for judicial action against Douglas, there can be little doubt that Albany was compelled to overlook such

---

174. ER, iv, 1-367.

175. ER, iv, 21.

176. ER, iv, 144, 193, 201, 216, 224, 341, 365, 368.

177. ER, iv, 253.

activities in order to retain the political backing of the leading magnatial families. In 1409 an inquiry was demanded following the violent extortion of £708-2-1 from the customs of Edinburgh by William Crawford and the earl of Douglas, but when the matter was referred to the Governor the latter timidly exonerated the custumars from all responsibility for the lost revenue and promised to consult the earl about the matter.[178] In 1422 duke Murdoch seems to have openly backed the pillaging of the customs for £1,108-9-4 was removed from the customs returns of Edinburgh by the earl of Douglas, partly to pay for his pensions and the remainder 'for himself' ('pro se') through a gift of the Governor.[179] The position of royal custumars at tthis juncture inenviable. They were constantly overawed and bullied by member of powerful baronial families while these official remained completely unprotected by royal justice. Any embarassement to the custumars was saved by the fact that the sums of money extorted from their receipts were normally allowed in their accounts, thus exonerating them from the duty to retrieve the sums involved. Examples of deforcement and the employment of physical violence against various custumars were numerous and reflected the dominant position attained by certain sections of the nobility in early fifteenth century society. During the period of the Albany regencies, frequent mention was made of payments being submitted by custumars 'under compulsion' or 'by force' for which the auditors of the Exchequer were forced to grant allowances. In 1414 an allowance of £8 was granted to Norman Young, custumar of Linlithgow, since he had been imprisoned by James Douglas in Abercorn castle until the sum in question had been handed over to Douglas.[180] In 1409 the custumars of Edinburgh were incarcerated in the castle by sir William Crawford in order to encourage their surrender of royal revenue.[181]

---

178. ER, iv, 81, 118.

179. ER, iv, 368.

180. ER, iv, 193.

181. ER, iv, 81.

Even when custumars attempted to halt this persistant defrauding of royal finances, the intrinsic weakness of their position rendered most attempts useless. In 1412 the custumars of Edinburgh had arrested woll belonging to William Borthwick and James Douglas for the payment of outstanding customs, but the arrest was subsequently broken and the merchandise shipped abroad without the submission of any duty.[182] In other royal burghs similar illicit activities were occurring, many of which must have gone unrecorded. During the absence of James I, the earl of March and members of his family appear to have made considerable inroads into the customs returns from the burgh of Dunbar,[183] while James Dalyrimple, custumar of Ayr maintained that no goods were customed in the years 1409, 1410, 1411 except those loaded into a single vessel, but even the customs from that source had been plundered by William Wallace of Craigie.[184]

However, with the return of James I from captivity in England in 1424, the position altered drastically for, with the fall of the house of Albany and resurgance of a monarchy not dependant on the nobility for political support, the profits from the great customs once again flowed into the royal coffers. However during the minority of his son, James II, the weakness of the crown's position resulted in a reversion to further pillaging of the great customs. James, earl of Angus was actively engaged in filching royal revenue from the custumars of North Berwick and Haddington.[185] Between 1438 and 1447 the earl of Angus seized a total of £149 from the customs returns of North Berwick and a further £513 from those of the burgh of Haddington between 1438 and 1445. At the same time Adam Hepburn of Hailes removed almost £100 in five years from the gross customs yield of Dunbar.[186] The remoteness of the burgh of Inverness rendered the customs

---

182. ER, iv, 144.

183. ER, iv,251, 278, 293.

184. ER, iv, 246.

185. ER, v, 98, 115, 116, 127, 136, 144, 177, 182. 276.

186. ER, v, 75, 100, 112-3, 124, 144.

returns from that burgh easy prey for an unscrupulous magnate like the earl of Ross, who persistantly plundered royal revenues from other sectors of crown property in that area. Between 1436 and 1447 £573-10-4 from the profits of the great customs of Inverness were diverted into the hands of the earl and again between 1460 and 1464, during the minority of James III, at least a further £74-12-3 was lost to the crown.[187] In the period of factional government during the minority of James II, both William, lord Crichton and the Livingstones, used their official positions to divert royal income into their own pockets. Lord Crichton, as chancellor, keeper of Edinburgh castle and one of the principal political figures during the minority, was in the perfect position to exploit royal revenues. In 1443 William, lord Crichton was granted 700 marks from the customs of Edinburgh, to endure until the king's majority, but two years later a fresh concession of £700 from the same source was announced for his fee as keeper of Edinburgh castle.[188] By 1447 the fee head been reduced to the more reasonable figure of £266-13-4 annually.[189] Apart from large official pensions, lord Crichton was in receipt of substantial quantities of cash, sometimes on the pretext of official expenses but frequently without any obvious reason. In 1438 a total of £457-13-4 was received by Crichton from the issues of the great customs ostensibly for preparations for the king's coronation, which included the purchase of wheat, Hamburg ale, Greek wine, red wine and other provisions required for the occasion.[190] In addition lord Crichton, seems to have arbitrarily removed large quantities of cash from the custumars of Edinburgh, in 1438 £1,068-17-1 was delivered to Crichton

---

187. ER, v, 191, 265, vii, 296.

188. ER, v, 125, 146, 147. Actual receipts included £133-6-8 in 1443 and £566-13-4 the following year. ER, v, 180, 221. In 1445 only £233-6-8 was allowed from the custumars' accounts but in 1446 the full £700 seems to have been disbursed to Crichton.

189. ER, v, 275, 310, 344, 380, 438, 497.

190. ER, v, 24, 36.

while in 1442 £940 was also extracted.[191] In conclusion, between 1437 and 1448 (excluding the years 1438 to 1440 when only a few custumars' accounts were recorded), over £5,000 was received by lord Crichton from the customs in one form or another. The Livingstones did not benefit so widely from the customs as lord Crichton, although in 1444 James Livingstone, captain of Stirling castle, was in receipt of over £150 from various custumars.[192] However during the reigns of James III and IV such overt plundering of royal customs tended to die out although customs evasion still remained a serious problem.

Although customs exemptions and remissions tended stemmed from the crown, nevertheless they greatly restricted the potential profit originating from the great customs. Under normal circumstances, the customs books and the custumar's gross charge included in their totals entries relating to the exportation of merchandise for which an exemption or remission had been gained, although an allowance was recorded in the discharge of the same account. Although remissions passed through the custumars' accounts this tended to involve only paper work as no actual money passed through the custumar's hands. Armed with a letter of remission from the crown, the exporter or his representative would have been able to ensure the receipt of a cocket and the exportation of the goods involved without submitting the usual customs levy.

Customs exemptions and remissions seem to have benefitted many sections of late Mediaeval society. As mentioned above, the king's own merchandise was exported free of all customs levies. Such allowances were frequently extensive, for in 1503 the custumar of Edinburgh was discharged £52-13-4, the custom on 3 lasts, 9 sacks, 12 stones of wool exported by David Beaton on the king's behalf to pay for items purchased abroad for marriage of James IV.[193] Remissions and exemptions granted to one or more

---

191. ER, v, 38, 117.
192. ER, v, 147, 151, 152, 155.
193. ER, xii, 164.

individuals were in effect royal concessions designed as inducements, rewards for services rendered or methods of repaying a crown debt. Occasionally, such concessions were employed as an inducement to foreign tradersto frequent Scottish shores, as in 1464 when half the custom paid by Breton merchants at Drumfries was remitted in order to encourage them and others like them to trade with Scotland.[194] Not unnarurally the majority of customs remissions were conceded to members of the mercantile community, both native and foreign, with little inidcation of underlying motivations. In most cases, remission of part or whole of the customs duty on merchandise exported from Scotland presented the crown with a convenient method of repaying debts or paying for royal supplies transported to Scotland. During the reign of James I, remission of customs was a common method of reimbursing royal suppliers like Peregrin and Lazarine Grellus of Genoa, Jenkin Lemmon, Thomas Bernwell and Thomas Weston of London.[195] During the fifteenth century a substantial proportion of such allowances were in response to the provision and transportation of commodities to the king's household. In 1507 hides and herring belonging to William Rose, master of the velle 'le Stene' were exported freely in return for flour, salt, iron and canvas purchased by the comptroller for the king's use,[196] while two years later the comptroller, James Redheuch, was remitted the custom on his wool and hides for wine bought for the king's household during his period of office.[197] Customs remission also proved a convenient way of repaying royal debts. In 1450 £23-16-11 of the customs payable by Adam Cosour and his brothers was remitted in the account of the custumars of Stirling as part repayment of a royal debt of £52-15/-, oved to Adam for overexpenditure in his last account as custumar of the burgh.[198] Similarly, in 1483 a total of £132-12-2 was remitted from

---

194. ER, vii, 282.
195. ER, iv, 406, 445, 483, 531, 587, 629.
196. ER, xii, 592.
197. ER, xiii, 231.
198. ER, vi, 370.

the custom levied on the goods of Isobelle Williamson as part payment of 500 marks advanced by her to James III.[199] In 1504 and 1505 Henry Cant received a customs allowance of £43-5-11 on his merchandise exported from Leith as part repayment of a larger debt owed to him by the crown.[200] Remissions were also granted to individuals in repayment for services performed on the crown's behalf. In 1450 the customs payable by lord Seton on goods exported from Leith was remitted to the tune of £18-18-11 at the time of his voyage to Flanders with the king's ambassadors.[201] In 1510 the custumar of Irvince received a remission of £3 from the customs levied on salmon in return for his services in Ireland.[202] Also remissions were conceded for a variety of other reasons, in 1489 the wool custom owed by George Towers at £20 was remitted since the merchandise had been captured by priates [203] while in 1509 wool belonging to the late Patrick Hume of Fastcastle was exported free of royal customs, which had amounted to a total of £62-13-4 in order to ransom his son from the infidels.[204] In 1501 sixteen lasts of herring belonging to the bishop of Lismore, now a student in Paris, were exported free of charge, presumably as a contribution towards the bishop's educational costs.[205] Although many remissions and exemptions recorded in the accounts of the custumars, had unknown motivations, it seems probable that the vast majority were conceded by the crown to pay for supplies purchased on behalf of the king's household, repay royal debts or act as recompense for royal service.

Although many remissions only endured for a single year, extended exemptions for a specific period, at the king's discretion, or for the

---

199. ER, ix, 213, 215, 216, 217.

200. ER, xii, 263, 373.

201. ER, v, 383.

202. ER, xiii, 368.

203. ER, x, 143.

204. ER, xiii, 231. Although this represented a considerable loss of revenue, James IV, retained a life long desire to participate in a crusade against the Turks in the Holy Land and would obviously have been generous to those who had engaged in such ventures.

205. ER, xi, 372.

lifetime of the grantee were also conceded.[206] On 2 October 1506 James IV granted Martin Lenalt, a merchant from Brittany, the free export of his goods from Scotland for life, which concession was fairly extensive since it included all his merchandise, although he had to swear that every commodity exported under his name was in fact his own property, and in addition, he received a special licence to trade anywhere in Scotland in vessels of under a hundred tons with complete freedom despite contrary statutes.[207] Margaret Crichton, the illegitimate daughter of William, lord Crichton and Margaret, the youngest sister of James III, was the cause of two interesting gifts of customs exemption. Margaret married wealthy Edinburgh merchants, William Todrik and George Halkerstone and gifts of lifetime immunity from the great customs probably represented the most practical form of dowry. On 8 February 1505-6 the former burgess received, on the conclusion of the marriage contract, a liftetime remission from all customs duties payable on his merchandise exported from Leith.[209] On 4 July 1510, Margaret's second marriage to George Halkerstone was also accompanied with a similar concession of custums immunity for life, although in this case, an upper limit of 100 marks was put on the value of the gift.[210] Halkerstone seems to have profitted greatly from the arrangement, for, between the date of the gift and 1513, he received allowances from the accounts of the custumars of Edinburgh totalling £161-10-2.[211]

---

206. RSS, i, 99, 1335, 1446.
207. RSS, i, 1335.
208. Margaret Crichton was at least for the period from 1495 to 1501 brought up at court for she received a clothing allowance from the treasurer. TA, i, 265, ii, 55.
209. RSS, i, 1219. ER, xii, 465. Allowances following this gift totalled only £94-16-8 to William Todrik who died sometime between mid summer 1506 and the same season in the following year. ER, xii, 465, 594.
210. RSS, i, 2089. ER, xiii, 367.
211. ER, xiii, 367, 391, 393, 486, 575. Halkerstone according to Paul, died at Flodden. Paul , The Scots Peerage, iii, 67. When Margaret Crichton married for the third time to George, earl of Rothes the latter succeeded to the privilege of exemption. ER, xiv, 335.

During the fifteenth century individual grants of customs exemption proved to be a considerable drain on crown resources. For instance, in 1448 William, earl of Douglas was allowed the free export of eighty sacks of his own wool from the port of Leith at a loss to the crown of £106-13-4.[212] However, during the reign of James IV the practice appears to have snowballed out of all control. In 1491 the cost to the custumars of concessions of free export amounted to £191-10-7, but 1503 the cost of such grants had risen to £337-7-7 and they reached a peak of £493-16-11 and £547-2-3 between 1507 and 1509.[213] A list of those benefitting from royal remissions revealed a fairly wide social cross section. Apart from wealthy native burgesses like William Brownhill, Robert and Andrew Barton and Alexander Forrester, other benefactors included foreign merchants, John Collait of Brittany, William of Gascony, Martin of Spain and Fernando Baptiste, ecclesiastic, the abbot of Melrose and the archbishop of Glasgow and magnates, Archibald, earl of Argyll, George, lord St.John, and Patrick Hume of Fascastle.[214] Certain individuals were in receipt of fairly extensive exemptions, for, between 1501 and 1513 a potential customs yield of £573-19-9 was remitted to Robert Barton,[215] while James, earl of Arran received an allowance of £73-14-5 from the customs levy on his own goods between 1505 and 1508.[216] However, not all customs exemptions involved the loss of large portions of potential royal revenue. On 23 February 1506-7, Archibald, earl of Argyll was in receipt of a customs remission on all his goods exported from Dumbarton, Ayr and Irvine, but between that date and 1513, the custumars of these burghs were required to seek allowances on only four occasion, at a total loss of only £15-11-4.[217] The concession

---

212. ER, v, 311.
213. ER, x, 295-306, xii, 154-167, xiii, 84-96, 225-238.
214. See Appendix No.B/5 (f).
215. ER, xii, 91, 164, 263, 373, 466, 594, xiii, 93, 98, 230, 365, 575.
216. ER, xii, 463, 595, xiii, 97.
217. RSS, i, 1436. ER, xii, 371, 599, xiii, 87, 226.

of customs exemptions and remissions as a form of royal patronage, reward and debit repayment was increasingly employed by James IV, especially in his relationship with the mercantile and commercial community. The proliferation of exemptions and remissions to member of the mercantile, both native and foreign was undoubtely the result of the crown's employment of this expedient as a convenient method of repaying royal supplies for their purchase of commodities for the crown. Concerning the use of custom exemption as a method of encouraging trade, there is little concrete evidence, although the grant of exemption to Martin Lenault, a Bretan merchant, included all his exports from Scotland for life and also a special licence to trade in any Scottish port.[218] In order to avoid other merchants exporting their merchandise in the name of a grantee who was in receipt of an exemption or remission and thus defrauding the crown of customs revenue, most letters patent or those granted under the privy seal limited the concession to 'his awn propir gudis and merchandice, and that he have nocht gudis of uther persouns under colour of thaim, under the pain that of the law may folow'. Contravention of this condition may have been the motive behind the termination of the grant of remission gifted to John Hill, burgess of Aberdeen, in 1509 when the custumars of Edinburgh were ordered not to obey the royal letters granted to Hill two years earlier.[219]

As well as individuals, gifts of customs exemption were also granted to certain burghs. Whether legally granted or of more doubtful strength, the crown, viewing the loss of revenue which such exemptions entailed, frequently attempted to resume its right to these alienated duties. For instance, on 16 April 1452 James II gifted the inhabitants of the community of Dysart, as a favour to William, earl of Orkney, who was lord over the

---

218. RSS, i, 1335.

219. RSS, i, 1494. ER, xiii, 232. Either the order to cease any future allowances for customs exemption in favour of John Hill was resinded or else remained a dead letter, since in 1510 a remission of £6-2-3 was allowed to Hill and in 1512 a further 13/4 was remitted. (ER, xiii, 365, 487.)

town, perpetual freedom from all customs duties on salt.[220] However, on 2n August 1479 the inhabitants of the town of Dysart were summoned for the illegal detention of the salt custom and the lords of the Council decerned that they were bound to submit the usual custom on exported salt since the grant of 1452 had fallen under the king's revocation, having been issued during the minority of James II.[221] The original concession was probably made to attract the loyalty of the earl of Orkeny during the Douglas crisis and now James III employed this legal technicality to resume the crown's rights to the customs. The question of the liability of Aberdeen burgesses to submit custom on salmon exports appears to have been of issue between the crown and the burgess community of Aberdeen. In 1438 certain of the burgesses had refused to pay the levy, claiming a letter of respite from the late James I.[222] By 1475 the burgesses as well as foreigners were paying custom on exported salmon.[223] However the situation was reversed in the crisis year of 1482 when James III gifted the inhabitants of the community of Aberdeen perpetual exemption from the payment of custom on salmon extracted from the waters of the Dee and the Don.[224] Four years later the privilege so recently granted by James III to the burgesses of Aberdeen was revoked and an inquest was to be made by the most trustworthy dignitories of the burgh to assess the value of the lasts and barrels of salmon exporterd from the realm during the previous year.[225] Despite this decision, the custumars of Aberdeen appear to have met with considerable burghal resistance in the initial enforcement of this order and in 1537 these claims were against revived.[226] In addition, on 6 December 1452 the

---

220. RMS, ii, 543.

221. ER, ix, 628.

222. ER, v, 17.

223. ER, viii, 319.

224. RMS, ii, 1529, 1566.

225. ER, ix, 444.

226. ER, ix, 554, x, 64, 134, 236, 387, xvii, 47. ADC, iii, 463.

burgesses of Aberdeen gained a perpetual relief from the payment of all customs on salt and all types of skins, which concession seems to have endured for the entire fifteenth century since no such accounts were rendered by the custumars.[227] Also on 9 November 1451 James II granted the merchants of the burgh of Edinburgh exemption from great customs payable on salt and various types of skins, in the same mould as the above concession to the mercantile community of Aberdeen.[228] The concession endured until 1468 when the practice of not raising customs on various types of skins was terminated and in future the custumars of Edinburgh were to be charged with this levy.[229] In 1460 the custom levy on salt was resurrected in the accounts of the custumars of Edinburgh.[230] It would appear that many of these concessions were forced on the crown in times of stress when the king was compelled to rely on the political and financial support of the royal burghs but when the political situation improved, every attempt was made by the crown to reclaim these gifts which had proved to be a persistent and sometimes heavy drain on royal income. Throughout the fifteenth century the Scottish crown, especially during periods of political stress, seems to have relied heavily on the political and financial support of the burgess communities in the larger urban centres. Undoubtedly most of these burghal concessions were sold for large compositions or loans submitted to the crown. Although there is no records of such sales, it is likely that the cash was paid directly to the crown for personal use, circimventing either the comptroller or treasurer. Although most of these exemptions to burghal communities were eventually revoked, a certain amount of evasion continued. Such a situation forced the king to issue a letter under the privy seal on

---

227. Charters and Writs relating the the History of the Royal Burgh of Aberdeen. charter 18.

228. RMS, ii, 507. The gift also included custom exemption to strangers and unfreement in these exports if they purchased pelts and salt from burgesses of Edinburgh.

229. ER, vii, 589.

230. ER, vii, 36.

18 June 1507 to the custumars of Aberdeen commanding them to make an open proclamation in the market place ordering all strangers and subject of the king not to export salmon 'unsene and uncustumyt and the custume thairof unpaid' under the paid of escheat.[231] The custumars of various royal burghs never seem to have accounted for customs dues levied on certain commodities. For instance, from the reign of James I, the custumars of Inverness accounted regularly only for the profit derived from the export of hides with no mention of cloth, wool, woolfelts or other pelts. The majority of custumars retained a certain reluctance to account for the revenue derived from all custumable commodities, many used the excuse that no exports departed from the port concerned.

Also certain religious houses and foundations claimed exemption from all or part of the customs payable on their merchandise. Many of these exemptions and remissions tended to be of considerable antiquity. The Abbey of Dunfermline enjoyed large commercial privileges. Robert I had granted the monks of Dunfermline freedom from custom and in addition, from at least 1329, they were entitled to collect the great customs from the burghs of Dunfermline, Kirkcaldy, Queensferry and Musselburgh along with the right to employ a cocket seal.[232] Also the bishop of St.Andrews enjoyed a similar freedom from customs duties within the bounds of his regality. However during the fourteenth century customs levied at the port of St.Andrews were collected by royal custumars on the crown's behalf, but on 28 May 1405 Robert III gifted all right to the great customs on wool, woolfells and hides within the town and territory of St.Andrews to the bishop, who received the to appoint custumars and use his own cocket seal.[233] The profits from the great customs of the burgh of St.Andrews were transferred from the crown to the bishop and there is no mention of these accounts in the custumars' rolls

---

231. RSS, i, 1492.

232. Registrum de Dunfermelyn, 232-3, 246-7, 269-70. ADC, ii, 488.

233. ER, iii, 623-4.

until 1473 when the custumars of St.Andrews once again accounted at the Exchequer for the duty levied on goods 'grown outside the regality'.[234] In 1475 the custumars accounted at the Exchequer for the great customs payable from goods originating from both outside and inside the regality of St.Andrews to the tune of £82-8-2 which was the property of the bishop but which was received by the king as repayment of a debt owed to the latter by the bishop.[235] On 13 March 1351-2 David II granted the Abbey of Arbroath a concession of the entire profit from the great customs levied on merchandise originating from the burgh, port and regality of Arbroath along with the gift of its own cocket seal.[236] Despite this concession, in 1392 Robert III reduced the gift to only a quarter of the great customs levied on goods 'grown' in the regality of the monestary, a situation which seems to have continued for most of the fifteenth century.[237] However there was an interlude of twenty two years between 1450 and 1472 when the custumars of Arbroath seem to have failed to account at the royal Exchequer either through the full grant of David II being regained by the Abbey or else the accounts have been lost.[238] Nevertheless, from 1472 until 1522 the monestary again received only one quarter of the gross custom returns of the burgh.[239]

However, other ecclesiastical bodies were in receipt of mor limited concessions. The Abbey of Melrose enjoyed freedom from customs duties payable on its own wool to a limit of fifty sacks.[240] Also Robert III gifted the convent of Deer exemption from all customs levied on twenty sacks of wool

---

234. ER, viii, 195-6, 251-2. The gross income amounted to:
1472-3. £60-14-11
1473-4. £50- 9-7

235. ER, viii, 319. The debit presumably repaid, the accounts of the custumars of St.Andrews once again disappear from the custumars' rolls.

236. Registrum Nigrum de Aberbrothoc, 23.

237. ER, iii, 297-8.

238. ER, viii, 384.

239. ER, xiv, 50.

240. APS, i, 523, 580. ER, iv, 19. RMS, i, 841. Liber de Melros, ii, 401-2.

belonging to the monestary.[241] On 19 October 1488, the victorious James IV granted a royal confirmation at the instance of one of his principal supporters, sir William Knollis, the preceptor of Torphichen and lord St.John of Jerusalem, of charters granted to the Hospitallers by Malcolm IV, Alexander II, Alexander III, James II and III. As in the case of other earlier grants, the original charters to the Hospitallers mentioned from tolls ('tholoneum') but more recent confirmations has substituted the term customs as there was no agreement as to the exact nature of these 'tolls'.[242] Therefore, the preceptor of Torphichen received customs immunity on all goods and merchandise sent abroad for the payment of the preceptor's 'responsion', extending to 200 ducats, 'and that yearly in our Exchequer it shall be seen to what sum of custom the goods extended and so much was to be allowed to the preceptor'.[243] Lord St.John benefitted from annual customs allowances on his salmon exported from the port of Aberdeen until 1497 when the auditors discovered that the concession had fallen under the king's revocation and was not to be allowed by the custumar in the future.[244] However, subsequent to that statement, a remission of custom on eight lasts of salmon continued to be allowed annually to the custumar of Aberdeen for the same reason.[245]

Towards the end of the reign of James IV the officer of custumar-general was initiated undoubtedly a further financial expedient to extract a greater return from the great customs. Between February and August 1510 the office was held jointly by Patrick Paniter, the king's secretary, and Thomas Dickson, rector of Turriff, who also retained the office of custumars Edinburgh, thus exercising even greater control over the royal customs.

---

241. ER, iv, 13. RMS, i, App 2, 1836.

242. Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, 119, 170, 172. Liber de Melros, i, 15, 162.

243. RMS, ii, 1791.

244. ER, x, 134, 237, 363, xi, 50.

245. ER, xi, 220, 375, xii, 86-7, 162, 265, 378, xiii, 237, 372.

Between these dated most of the custumars submitted their surplusses to Dickson.[246] On 19 October 1510 in a royal letter issued under the privy seal, Andrew Stewart, bishop of Caithness, treasurer, and Dickson were appointed joint custumars-general with the power of deputation and escheat. The arrangement, in fact, assumed the form of a lease of the entire great customs as the appointments were to endure for a total of three years and the grantees were to submit an annual 'reddendo' to the exchequer of £4,000 in equal portions, of which, allowance was to be made to Dickson from the first instalment of his submission for the balance of £3,341 at the foot of the last treasurer's account 'as is unpaid to him be us or our thesaurare be assignatioun or uther sais'.[247] The experiment of leasing individual burgh customs was thus repeated on a more universal scale with this arrangment. It represented an attempt on the part of the crown to achieve a steady, calculable income from the great customs leaving the lessees the problem of collecting the revenue from the local custumars. However the financial settlement was perhaps over optimistic, for the crown demanded an annual return of £4,000 whereas the real income accruing to the comptroller during the three years prior to the lease amounted to only £2,612, £2,544, and £2,704 respectively.[248] It also afforded an ideal opportunity of settling the debt owed to Thomas Dickson from the treasurer's account. However, instead of lasting three years, the arrangement seems to have been dissolved after only five months, since, on 13 March 1510-11 the bishop of Caithness was conceded a tack of the great customs 'of all and sindry the burghs, tounis, portis within the realme' with power to excers and use the sammyn, deputis, clerkis of coketis, tronaris and all uther officiaris neidfull to create and mak under him, or to set the said custume as he thinkis maist expedient for us in all or in part, assignand the said cusumis

---

246. ER, xiii, 359-373.

247. RSS, i, 2140.

248. ER, xiii, 84-97, 225-238, 359-373.

to the sustentatioun of the houshald', which was to last as long as the bishop retained the office of comptroller and 'forther the kingis will'.[249] On 11 March 1512-3 Andrew Forman, bishop of Moray, was appointed custumar for the entire realm for the period of nine years but the new grant appears to have remained ineffective as the local custumars continued to submit their receipts to the comptroller, James Redheuch.[250] Attempts to narrow responsibility for the royal revenue derived from the great customs and to arrange for the submission of a fixed annual farm for the lease of the customs failed since the arrangement was financially unrealistic and consequently there was little demand for any lengthy participacion in the scheme. These experiments also revealed the crown's desperation to halt the falling returns from the customs but it tended to work against the economic climate of a declining export trade.

Throughout the later Middle Ages, the great customs of Scotland were persistantly burdened with substantial allowances for fees, pensions and annuities. Such concessions were allowed to custumars at the Exchequer on production of a royal letter, issued under the great or privy seals, stating the nature and extent of the gift. These assignments on the gross customs returns represented an important section of royal patronage since such allowances were usually granted to attract the loyalty of influencial members of the community, as reward for services to the crown, to support religious foundations and as annual payment or fee for an official port under the crown.

Under Robert II and III, and especially during the regency of the dukes of Albany, large assignments on the profit emanating from the great customs were distributed among members of influencial baronial houses. Since Scotland lacked a strong central authority in the late fourteenth and

---

249. RSS, i, 2223.

250. RSS, i, 2483. ER, xiii, 569, 579. Even Forman himself as lessee of the great customs in the areas of Moray, Caithness and Ross, paid his farm of £50 to the comptroller.

early fifteenth centuries, excessive largess on the part of the central authority seemed the only alternative to complete anarchy. The cumulative effect of these concessions on royal finances was extremely detrimental, not only on account of the value of many of these gifts but also since a large proportion were granted to the recipient in fee and heritage, making it extremely difficult for the crown to resume these alienations of its 'property'. For instance, the earl of Crawford received two hereditary grants of 100 marks from the customs of Dundee and Aberdeen, sir Murdoch Stewart, eldest son of the duke of Albany, was in receipt of 100 marks from the customs of Aberdeen, sir Robert Erskine 80 marks from Linlithgow, sir James Douglas of Dalkeith £40 from Edinburgh, and David Lindsay of Kinneff 40 marks from Montrose, to mention only a few of the larger gifts.[251] Despite the fact that little attempt was made by the central authority to query or dispute the recipients' right to the various pensions, annuities and fees extracted from the great customs during the first quarter of the fifteenth century, in the case of the annuity associated with the duchess of Rothesay and claimed by her present husband, Walter Haliburton, haphazard and frequently unsuccessful efforts were adopted by the government to resume the concession.[252] As the husband of the widow of David, duke of Rothesay since 1403, Walter Haliburton laid claim to the latter's pensions of £233-6-8 annually from the customs of Edinburgh and £100 from those of Linlithgow during the lifetime of his wife and he appears to have received part of whole of his inheritance from the great customs on several occasions.[253] However, because of an alarming

---

251. See Appendix No.B/5 (g)

252. Mary, daughter of Archibald, earl of Douglas, married the duk of Rothesay on 28 April 1398 and the latter at this stage was in receipt of an annual pension of £100 from the customs of Linlithgow and £240 from the customs returns of Edinburgh. ER, iii, 286, 291, 353, 355, 379, 382.

253. ER, iv, 2, 19, 43, 42, 73, 80, 112, 115, 116, 140, 142, 167, 176, 300, 343.

decline in the gross annual receipt from the customs [254] and also on account of the doubtful validity of Haliburton's assertions,[255] the latter frequently resorted to pillaging the customs of Edinbrugh and Linlithgow to retrieve his due.[256] In addition, several custumars sought allowances for annuities granted to ecclesiastical bodies like the Dominicans of Perth who were in receipt of £7-6-8 from both the customs of Dundee and Perth and the chaplain at St. Salvator's praying for the soul of the late David, duke of Rothesay who claimed £5 annually from the customs of Dundee.[257] The cumulative effect of these concessions on the net returns of the crown from the great customs was considerable. In 1414 a total of £730 was allowed to the custumars from pensions and annuities while in 1421 £762 was removed.[258] However, the full effect of these gifts was seldom fully realised in the custumars' accounts for, in many cases, the shortage of available funds frequently resulted in a diminution of the actual amount allowed to certain pensioners and a considerable portion of fees and pensions were, although attached to the customs returns of a specific burgh, paid through the office of the chamberlain. Concerning the first point, in years of a low gross customs returns or in years of excessive plundering and evasion of customs duties, pensioners in the most affected burghs were forced to accept reduced payments. Although sir Robert Erskine was entitled to an annual pension of 80 marks from the customs of Linlithgow, in the custumars' accounts of 1414 and 1415, Erskine received allowances for only £11-18-3 and £20-9-1

---

254. See Appendix No.B/5 (b)

255. ER, iv, 253. In 1416 the customars of Edinburgh maintained that Walter Haliburton received his pension of £233-6-8 through his wife's rights and, as a result, an inquiry into the validity of the claim was to be undertaken.

256. ER, iv, 193, 216, 224, 244, 253, 278, 296. However, the situation was resolved in 1420 when Mary died. ER, iv, 343.

257. ER, iv, 10, 16, 17.

258. ER, iv, 214-227, 337-348.

respectively.[259] There was obviously a scale of priorities in such situations since several pensioners were allowed the full reckoning during the entire period of the Albany regencies. In 1422 the account of the custumar of Edinburgh recorded no pension allowances since £1,108 out of a gross receipt of £1,160 had been plundered by the earl of Douglas and his accomplices.[260] Secondly, although sir Thomas Steward of Kelly was assigned an annual pension of 20 marks from the customs of Montrose the sum was allowed to the chamberlain in the custumar's discharge and physical responsibility for payment of the annuity rested with the chamberlain.[261] Numerous pensions and annuities were discharged in this manner. However, many such entries failed to appear in the actual account of the chamberlain as in the payment of 10 marks from the customs of Ayr to Alan Cathcart in 1409 which allowance was recorded in the charge of the chamberlain's receipts, but not in the discharge.[262] There were two possible explanations, firstly that the allowance was never received by Cathcart but the 10 marks was submerged in other large payments paid out by the chamberlain to other sources of greater priority or secondly that the sum was submitted to Cathcart from part of the substantial annuities received by the governor.

Included in the financial reforms initiated by James I in 1424, was an intensified and generally successful campaign against the proliferation of hereditary pensions and annuities attached to the issues of the great customs. By the terms of the act of Parliament, 'all the gret and smal custumys and burovmaillis of the realme byde and remane with the king till his leuing. And gif ony manner of persone makis ony clame till ony part

---

259. ER, iv, 192, 215.

260. ER, iv, 368.

261. ER, iv, 366. After the entry in the custumar's discharge, the words 'de quibus camerarius respondebit' were entered, signifying that the payment was, in fact, discharged in the chamberlains' own account. ER, iv, 376.

262. ER, iv, 88, 97-103.

of the saide custumis that he schawe to the king quhat he has for him and the king sall mak him answer with avisment of his counsall'.[263] The profit from the great customs was stated to be part of the king's property raised to contribute to the cost of government rather than as a prop for royal patronage. Under the conditions established by the act, the majority of lay hereditary pensions payable from the great customs, were swept aside in a single stroke. Hereditary annuities granted under the great seals of Robert II or III, including the 20 mark allowance from the customs of Perth conceded to Andrew Mercer on 28 April 1383 [264] and the £20 annual pension granted by Robert III to John Livingstone from the customs of Linlithgow,[265] were the principal victims of James I's retrenchment. Because of the excessive largess displayed by the first two Stewart kings, any effective pruning of these assignments inevitabley concentrated on these gifts. Of the annuities which survived the cut, the vast majority were ecclesiastical endowments granted 'in pure and perpetual alms' and of relatively long standing.[266] Fees granted for life to John Scrimgeour and to William Gifford from the customs returns of Dundee and Edinburgh respectively seem to have been unaffected by the new arrangement although they required to receive fresh royal approval.[267] One exceptional survivor of the haulocost reaped by James I on hereditary pensions proved to be the 100 marks conceded annually from the customs of Dundee to the earl of Crawford.[268] However, since the gift seems to have dated from the reign of Robert I, it did not fall under the scope of the revocation. In fact, James I issued a letter to the custumars of Dundee in March 1430-1 confirming the legality of the of the annual allowance of the 100 marks from the gross custom receipts.[269]

---

263. APS, ii, 4.
264. RMS, i, 723. The letter of grant referred to a gift of 40 marks to Mercar and it was to be equally split between the burgh fram and great customs of Perth. In the early fifteenth century the grant was received by Micheel Mercar.
265. RMS, i, App. 2, Index A, 1770.
266. See Appendix No.B/5 (g)
267. ER, iv, 381, 383.
268. ER, iv, 360, 383.
269. ER, iv, 531-2.

The initial fiscal effect of the revocation of 1424 was dramatic, for, in the year 1420-1, pension allowances from the great customs totalled £761 but in the two years following the return of James I from England, only £152 and £166 was disbursed in fees and pensions.[270] Although James I was successful in ridding the customs of these hereditary encumbrances, it was not long before the same monarch was compelled to re-assign portions of the great customs for the purposes of royal patronage. For instance, in 1434 and 1435 the average annual allowance for annuities and fees amounted to just under £600,[271] approximately 10% of the total gross receipt. Yet, the style of the gift had altered, instead of grants in heritage, the pensions and annuities granted by James I and future Scottish Monarchs tended to be granted for a specific period, the life grant being the maximum duration. In contrast to the large annuities wrung from Robert II and Robert III the majority of fifteenth century assignation from the great customs tended to be of more modest proportions, although this was partly the result of a decline in the gross annual returns from this source.

Pensions and fees from the great customs in the fifteenth century tended to be granted either in response to service at court or as a method of repaying royal debts, in a similar fashion to remissions. For instance, on 7 May 1484 John Greenlaw, brouster to the queen, was in receipt of a life pension of 20 marks from the customs of Dundee 'for his service done and to be done to us',[272] while, on 4 October 1488, Thomas Spalding, burgess of Dundee, was granted a similar annuity of £20 from the customs of the same burgh 'for his services', a phrase employed to cover a multitude of motivations.[273] As well as pensions and annuities, the customs receipts

---

270. ER, iv, 337-348, 379-390, 400-417.

271. ER, iv, 554-577, 604-628.

272. ER, ix, 284.

273. RMS, ii, 1779. However, there is no record of this grant in the accounts of the custumars of Dundee. It can only be assumed that either Thomas Spalding died soon after the issue of the concession of else the gift was revoked before an allowance could be made.

provided sufficient funds to sustain allowances for annual fees to various royal officials and employees. From the 1440s the customs receipts were annually burdened with the payment of fees to houshold servants, doctors, foreign craftsmen, chaplains and other perosns in the pay of the crown. A substantial proportion of these allowances were later transferred to the accounts of either the comptroller or the treasurer. Shortage of funds had prevented the immediate transfer of responsibility for the payment of these fees from local sources to central financial officials, but during the reigns of James IV and V this process was in operation. For instance, in 1489 the custumars of Edinburgh sustained the cost of the fees of the marischal of the household and the keeper of the larder, the responsibility for which was later assumed by the comptroller.[274] Many pensions were conceded for life, but in 1478 Thomas Dunbarton, the king's tailor received a pension of £10 annually from the customs of Edinburgh 'during the king's pleasure'[275] whereas on 16 April 1483 George Robinson collected a yearly allowance of £20 from the custumars of Edinburgh until he was promoted to a benefice, valued for taxation purposes at £40 annually.[275] There appears to have been constant pressure on the grantee to seek frequent confirmation of his concession. On 8 January 1482-3 James III issued a letter under the great seal to the custumars of Edinburgh requesting them to make an annual allowance of £40 to Walter Bertram, burgess of Edinburgh and his wife Elizabeth for the duration of their lives. The gift was in response to the part played by Bertram in the delivery of the king from captivity in Edinburgh castle and for the damage and loss of property sustained by him during the incident.[277] On 2 February 1488-9 the grant was confirmed in

---

274. ER, ix, 143, xii, 182.

275. ER, viii, 219-220.

276. ER, ix, 220-1. In 1487 the value of the benefice was reduced to £20 tax valuation.

277. ER, ix, 219-200.

its entirity by James IV and on 14 June 1491 a new mandate was issued by the king in order to confirm future allowances.[278] It would seem that fees and pensions derived from the issues of the customs were constantly under review. Frequently, entries were made in the accounts ordering the custumar not to render any further payment on a particular annuity without a fresh royal mandate. In 1459 Elizabeth Sinclair, the widow of Patrick Dunbar, received an annuity of £20 from the customars of Haddington with an attached note calling for a new mandate.[279] On 9 July 1460 James II issued a precept to the custumars confirming the assignation of £20 from the customs, stating that 'oure wyl is ande straitly we charges yhou (the custumars) that yne content ande pay the saide sowme yeirly to the saide Elizabeth undyr al payne and changis may efftyr folow delyverying thir our lettres be yhou seyn and undyrstanding and anys schawin in oure chekkere', but, nevertheless, in 1462, there was a demand for another new mandate.[280] The pension was continued until 1480 on a fresh precept being issued under the signet of James III.[281] Similarly, in 1488 the annual allowance of £23-10/- payable from the customs of Haddington to a certain doctor Conrad for his fee and horse fodder was to be discontinued since the concession was terminated by the death of James III.[282] Despite that entry, payment continued to be made to Master Conrad for the next two years, although only 'by the king's grace'.[283]

---

278. ER, x, 141. RMS, ii, 1829.

279. ER, vi, 500.

280. ER, vi, 590, vii, 152.

281. ER, vii, 214.

282. ER, ix, 53. The letter of grant, dated 13 January 1477-8 related that the concession was to endure for the duration of Conrad's life or until promotion to a suitable benefice with no mention of its termination on the death of the king. RMS, ii, 1343.

283. ER, ix, 133, 235.

There can be little doubt that the Auditors of the Exchequer were continually engaged in checking the validity of various fees and pensions extracted from the great customs and many such allowances were in fact queries. Doubtless these efforts were stimulated by a desire fiscal retrenchment by reducing the allowances payable from the great customs. However commendable were the auditors' motives, the practical results were disappointing. Not only did fresh royal grants quickly fill the vacuum left by those which had been terminated but it would appear that the auditors found it an extremely difficult task to effect the removal of an allowance from the rolls. The examples above typified the general situation whereby queried concessions were either granted an continued existance by the crown or else the payment merely persisted in spite of official attempts to halt the grant. In short, the heavy conservatism of the Exchequer accounts tended to frustrate the retrenchment endeavours of the auditors for, once entered in the rolls, it was an extremely difficult task to remove these burdens.

However, even after the accession of James I, occasional large concessions to members of the baonial class continued to be associated with the custumars' accounts. During his reign, James I was forced to recognise the effective contribution of Alexander, earl of Mar to the stability and good order of the Highland regions and in 1430 the earl's pension of 200 marks from the customs of Aberdeen was resumed until his latter's death.[284] For 10 years from 1470 William, earl of Caithness and lord Sinclair, was in receipt of an yearly annuity of 400 marks from the customs of Edinburgh. Although on the surface an extravagant grant it proved to be a profitable investment on the part of the crown since this annual pension represented part of the exchange settlement between the earl and the king whereby the

---

284. ER, iv, 536, 567, 616. The pension was originally granted to earl Alexander in respect of his wife, Isabelle, countess of Mar and during the Albany regency had been paid to him annually through the chamberlain.

latter acquired direct control of the lands of the lordships of Shetland and Orkney, formerly the property of the Sinclairs. Since the grant was only for the life of earl William the detrimental effect of such a substantial concession was limited, especially since the earl died before Martinmas 1479-80.[285]

Perhaps one of the principal benefectors from royal patronage based on the profit from the great customs was the earl of Crawford. At the outset of the fifteenth century the earl of Crawford extracted substantial annual annuities from the customs returns of the northern burghs; 100 marks from the burgh of Dundee from a grant of Robert I, 100 marks from Aberdeen and 40 marks from Montrose.[286] During periods of Crawford ascendancy, namely the years before the fall of the Douglasses and during the majority of James III, the earl tended to be in receipt of most of his inheritance from the great customs, but, alternatively, when the family slipped into political obscurity or sufferred a minority, the crown was ever ready to resume the revenues in question. In fact, during the fifteenth century there existed a prolonged struggle between the crown and the earl of Crawford over the fate of these concessions. The pension from the customs of Aberdeen demonstrated the nature of this struggle, in 1424 the annuity failed to survive James I's retrenchment reforms but after the feast of Martinmas 1439-40 the earl retrieved the sasine on his pension despite the statement that James I died vested in the entire customs returns of the burgh and that James II had enjoyed similar possession until this date.[287]

---

285. RMS, ii, 997. ER, viii, 120, 190-1, 253, 312, 390, 466, 546, 630, ix, 78. The letter recorded in the Register of the Great Seal quoted the annual pension as being valued only at 50 marks. For details on the background to the exchange deal, see the chapter on 'The Acquisition and Administration of Royal Property.'

286. RMS , i, 309, 811, 822. ER, iii, 622, 625, 629.

287. ER, v, 71.

For the next five years the dominant local position achieved by the Lindsay connection coupled with the earl's political association with the earls of Ross and Douglas enabled Crawford to browbeat the crown into accepting the usurpation of its rights but on the collapse of opposition to the crown in 1455, coinciding with the death of earl Alexander, James II was in a sufficiently powerful position to resume the 100 marks pension from the customs of Aberdeen, a situation which was adequately demonstrated by the fact that the custumar was to receive no further allowance and the letters of grant were torn up by the king's own hand.[288] However, with the developing bond of affinity between James III and David, earl of Crawford, the latter was again able to assert his claim to the annuity and after illegally removing the pension for eleven years, the earl finally received written confirmation of his hereditary grant on 2 July 1483.[289] The earl remained in possession of the grant until his death in 1495 after which the annuity passed to his widow Margaret Carmichael in liferent, a situation which was confirmed by James IV.[290] Also in 1483 earl David succeeded in ressurecting his claim to the annual pension of 40 marks from the customs of Montrose, last paid to the Lindsays in 1407,[291] although during the reign

---

288. ER, vi, 24, 304. In the 1455 and 1457 accounts, outstanding allowances were conceded to the custumars but it was carefully stated that such payments have been made unjustly ('licit injuste'). James II's claim was based on the 1424 act of his father.

289. ER, viii, 198, 320, 388, 464, 550, ix, 77, 152, 227, 341. In 1475 the auditors required a new royal mandate before any further allowances were to be permitted. In 1480 it was recorded that earl David's rights to the pension in question were to be revealed by 2 October next before any payment was to be forthcoming.

290. RMS, ii, 1795. ER, x, 612, xi, 266. On 20 October 1488, after the defeat of James III at Sauchieburn, earl David, now the duke of Montrose received a royal confirmation of his pension from the great customs of Aberdeen from James IV. Also in the letter of confirmation was the king's agreement to the transfer of the rights to the pension to Margaret Carmichael for life. A similar arrangement was accepted for David's annuities from the customs of Dundee and Montrose.

291. ER, iv, 49, v, 301, 315, 340, 378-9, 431, 559, ix, 224, 227.

of James II until 1453, the earl of Crawford seems to have been engaged in the persistant removal of funds from the customs of Montrose to a total of almost £350. However, on the elevation of David to the dukedom of Montrose on 18 May 1488 all the profits from the burgh of Montrose, including the issues from the great customs, were granted in heritage to the duke and although he found himself on the losing side at Sauchieburn, James IV, in tune with the general conciliatory nature of the succeeding settlement, confirmed the duke's right to theentire customs returns from Montrose, but only for the duration of his life.[292] After his death, Margaret Carmichael, dowager duchess of Montrose, resumed the 40 mark pension from the customs of Montrose under the same conditions as the Aberdeen pension. From the chequered careers of the fifteenth century earls of Crawford, it is possible to trace the various tergiversations in the destiny of a portion of royal patrimony. The fate of these annuities depended very largely on the strength of the crown and also the nature of the relationship between the latter and the earl. Also it produced an interesting insight into the dilemma facing the crown in the later Middle Ages, the counteracting claims of royal patronage on the one hand and the persistant demand for retrenchment and the desire for increased revenue on the other.

The majority of items which appeared in the custumar's discharge tended to be of a general nature or as with allowances for building, shipping and military expeditions, have been included in chapters on accounts dealing with these items.[293] However, during the reigns of James I and II two features formed an important part of the custumars' discharges.

---

292. RMS, ii, 1725, 1895. On 17 October 1488 a recissory act was passed destroying the recently created dukedom and also the gift of the customs issues from Montrose.
APS, ii, 211. On the death of David, duke of Montrose, the custumars of Montrose, whose accounts had vanished from the Exchequer Rolls in 1488, once again accounted at the royal Exchequer in 1496. ER, x, 63, 611.

293. Specialized expenditure has been reviewed in the chapters dealing with the accounts of the treasurer and the comptroller.

Firstly, during the reign of James I there was considerable commercial contact between the Scottish crown and foreign merchants, on whom the former relied fairly extensively for the importation of various commodities. These transactions with foreign merchants reflected part of James I's attempt to lift the prestige and dignity of the Scottish crown, especially as most western European monarchies were actively engaged in the substantial importation of luxury items from eastern and southern Europe during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Trader John Lemmon, Thomas Weston and Thomas Bernwell of London, Peregrine and Lazarine Grellus of Genoa, Dominic Villanis of Florence and other were frequently commissioned by the crown for the provision of foreign commodities. Although the custumar's accounts did not reveal the nature of the goods imported by these merchants, the cash allowances to several custumars for payment demonstrated the extent of th business. These suppliers received payment in a variety of forms from the profits of the great customs in a straight cash allowance, in salmon which was purchased by the king at Aberdeen, Banff and Montrose and exported abroad by these traders and in customs remissions on the wool and salmon purchased in Scotland. Between 1425 and 1435 allowances from the gross customs receipts to foreign suppliers totalled £3,950, of which John Lemmon received £1,572, the Grellus brothers £837, Dominic Villanis £816, Thomas Bernwell £374 and five merchants from Prussia £152.[294] In addition, numerous and often expensive commodities were purchased by native merchants from the Flemish markets. Essentially, James I seems to have relied on two principal agents, John Duchman and John Turing, a leading Edinburgh merchant. During the period 1425 to 1430 John Duchman was in receipt of £716 from the great customs.[295] From the subsidy levied on the burghs for the king's ransom, for which accounts were rendered in July 1435

---

294. ER, iv, 379-628.

295. ER, iv, 379-514. There were no custumers' accounts between 1426 and 1427.

and December 1436, a substantial portion was in fact diverted to Turing for the cost of purchasing a variety of articles for the king's use. Between 1426 and 1429 John Turing supplied the royal household with 'furnishings' to the value of £413-2-4 [296] and from the account of the custumars of Edinburgh in March 1429-30 he received the additional sum of £907 for which Turing accounted in September 1436 along with £3,273-5-5 in Flemish groats which he had been diverted from the ransom from March, 1429-30.[297] The proceeds were expended on a selection of items, for instance £1,232-10-8 Flemish was spent on various 'furnishings' for the household, of which no particulars have been preserved, at least £365 on diplomatic expenses, £660 on artillery and armour, £243 on jewalry, including pearls and gold and silver adornments, £43-5/- was paid to Master James Alamanus for an ornament of ostrich feathers, pelts off the ewe's back, 24 Flemish ells of purple velvet and cotton to preserve the articles, £50 for the travelling expenses of experienced actors, £50 for two roundels of spices, and £20 to Thomas Lauder, burgess of Edinburgh, for Rhenish wine purchased in Dortrecht. In addition, £227-12-8 was conveyed to John Duchman who was engaged in similar activities. From the cash left over from the Edinburhg customs £520 Scots was expended on tents, wine, cloth, linen, fur and other commodities for the royal court and £218 paid to Duchman.[298] It is clear that James I introduced a degree of liberality in household and personal spending hitherto unknown at the Scottish court and which was possibly stimulated by his long contact with the more wealthy English monarchy. James contracted both foreign and native commercial agents and a large proportion of cost appears to have been borne by the issues of the great customs and ransom collected for the release of James I from captivity in England.

---

296. ER, iv, 412, 438, 472.
297. ER, iv, 509, 672-6.
298. ER, iv, 676-685.

Secondly, although payments were dispensed annually to the comptroller the the expenses of the royal household, during the early years of the reign of James II, the inadequacy of the funds supplied to central fiscal officials resulted in cash being drawn directly from the receipts of the custumars of Edinburgh to offset the cost of certain royal supplies. In 1446 £489-6-4 was set aside by the custumars of Edinburgh for the provision of linen, cloth, furs, thread, soap, spices, iron, canvas, saddles and other items as contained in the accountants' book examined at the Exchequer by the auditors.[299] Three years later £888 was allowed to the same custumars for the purchase of silk, velvet, cloth, linen, furs, Venetian and Cyprus gold and other merchancise for the use of the king and his household servants.[300]

The cash paid by the local custumars to central financial officials, the chamberlain, comptroller, treasurer or various other 'receivers, represented the real income from the great customs, in other words the money expended for the benefit of the king and his household. As with the gross receipts derived from the great customs, the net returns failed to demonstrate any increase during the course of the fifteenth century. However the position tended to fluctuate considerably, due mainly to the ability of the crown to assert its authority and to the demands of royal patronage. During the regency of Robert, duke of Albany, the net income submitted to the chamberlain declined from an annual average of £2,084 for the first part of this period to only £1,295 for the latter half. Large hereditary pensions and the persistant plundering and evasion of royal customs took their toll for of the £2,711 average annual gross custom receipt for the years 1418 to 1422, only £1,002 found its way into the chamberlain's coffers. During the reign of James I a dramatic increase in the gross

---

299. ER, v, 221.

300. ER, v, 346. The items purchased from the receipts of these accounts represented commodities for which the treasurer was mostly responsible in the latter half of the fifteenth century.

receipts of the custumars was also reflected in the net figures which averaged between £2,800 and £3,400 annually.

Although large sums of money were transferred from the local custumars to a variety of official receivers, namely the comptroller, the clerk of spices, the treasurer, Thomas Mireton, dean of Glasgow, Master John Winchester, Robert Gray, master of the mint and even directly into the king's coffers, it is clear that other persons of more doubtful status were in receipt of revenue from the custumars. It seems likely that these persons acted as royal agents, contracted to ensure the provision of certain articles for the king and members of his household. The exact position of certain individuals was more uncertain than others, for instance there was little indication of destiny of the £500 delivered by the custumars of Edinburgh to Robert Lauder, burgess of that burgh and the £46 submitted to Maurice Taylor in 1428, both of whom were ordered to account for their receipts.[301] On the other hand, it is probable that the £120 allowed to Alexander Craigy, apothecary, from the customs of Edinburgh in 1429 was in recompense for the supply of drugs and other commodities associated with his profession.[302] Although the evidence is sketchy it would seem that a substantial proportion of the debit section of the custumars' accounts comprised of allowances for supplies of merchandise to the court through either native or foreign agencies. From the death of James I until roughly 1462 the gulf between the gross and net income from the great customs windened considerably, due principally to extensive expenditure on the provision of multifarious merchandise for the king and his household, the fiscal burden of numerous fees and pensions and the existance of unwarranted allowances, especially during the minority of James II. In fact, during the 1440s the net income to the crown from the great customs amounted to only a third of the gross annual receipts. During the reign of James II, net returns from the great customs fluctuated considerably betweem £750 and £1,380 annually. Central control over the income from the

---

301. ER, iv, 436, 437.
302. ER, iv, 472.

great customs was extremely lax at this juncture especially since the unsettled political state of the country provided ample opportunity for baronial interference. The financial pressures placed on the customs were crippling as in 1448 when allowances for fees, pensions, customs remissions and other miscellaneous payments to individuals amounted to £913, those for local expenses to £709, those for royal supplies to £1,333 and £625 was repaid to the merchant communities of Aberdeen and Edinburgh for £250 in Flemish groats transmitted to Italian merchants in Flanders for the purchase of the bulls of William Turnbull, then bishop of Dunkeld. Against these substantial expenses only £1,301 was transferred from the custumars to the comptroller.[303] Further evidence of the disorganized state of the customs accounts in certain burghs at this period can be demonstrated by the frequent tendancy to over expenditure. In short, it would appear that the returns from the great customs in the mid fifteenth century were inadequate to deal with the pressures of expenditure placed upon them. By 1450 the Edinburgh customs accounts were overexpended to the tune of £912-8/- while two years earlier the accounts of Dundee recorded a deficit of £216. However, in contrast, the persistant removal of cash from the customs returns of Montrose by the earl of Crawford resulted in the accumulation of irretrievable arrears totalling over £242 by 1448.[305]

During the reigns of James III and IV increased accounting efficiency and the removal of responsibility for many items of expenditure

---

303. ER, vi, 297-318. The entry for the bulls of William Turnbull seems to have been in the form of a royal loan from the customs receipts to Turnbull in order to finance his elevation to the see of Glasgow. In 1450 a further allowance of £125 Scots was repaid to the burgesses of Dundee for an advance of £50 Flemish for Turnbull's applications. ER, v, 370.

304. ER, v, 315, 388.

305. ER, v, 316.

from the custumar to the comptroller and treasurer resulted in the narrowing of the gap between the gross and net income from the customs. For three decades after 1460 the comptroller's receipts from the great customs averaged approximately 50% of the gross annual revenue collected by the custumars but from the mid 1480s the level rose to between 60% and 70%.[306] During the late fifteenth and ealy sixteenth centuries, the crown was successful in extracting a greater return from customs. Under James III the net annual income from customs varied from £1,500 to £2,300 but in the following reign between £2,000 and £2,600 was transferred from the customs to the comptroller's accounts.[307] This increase in net income was due partly to a slight augmentation in the gross annual receipts from the great customs from the 1490s and partly to an overall reduction in the expenses attached to the customs accounts. In fact, the discharge side of the custumar's accounts during this period concentrated larely on allowances for customs remissions, pensions and fees to the exclusion of other items previously incorporated in these rolls. Between 1506 and 1510 the average annual expense total amounted to £1,123 of which £829 was disbursed on remissions, grants and assignments to individuals.[308] Although efforts were made in the later fifteenth century to offset the declining fiscal contribution of the great customs it is fairly obvious that the customs had ceased to be one of the main financial props of the government as in the fourteenth century.

---

306. See Appendix No.B/5 (b), (e).

307. See Appendix No.B/5 (e).These figures represented the average annual income over a four year period.

308. ER, xii, 591-9, xiii, 84-96, 225-238, 359-372.
The gross annual average income from the customs was £3,617.
The net annual average income from the customs was £2,494.

SHERIFF'S ACCOUNTS

Of all the Scottish financial records, the sheriffs' rolls have suffered the most through damage and loss. Concerning these accounts, a return of the records in the custody of the Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Scotland in 1800 revealed that they were 'tolerably complete' from about 1400, but it is probable that a fire in the Exchequer buildings in 1811 caused the destruction of most of these accounts.[1] The result was that only a few records survived of the sheriffs' financial dealings, namely the rolls of 1455, 1456, 1489 (unpublished), 1501, the parchment volume of 1471, the short accounts of the sheriff of Linlithgow for 1460 and 1463, and the accounts of the sheriff within the burgh of Perth from 1440 to 1447. The scarcity of these accounts makes any analysis of the sheriffs' contribution to crown income very difficult, but there is sufficient evidence, however, to ascertain major changes and developments in the office during the later Middle Ages.

From its inception under David I, the office of sheriff developed to include various financial, judicial and administrative functions, the former being the principal consideration of this study. In the middle ages, the office of sheriff in Scotlnd developed as one of the principal financial officers under the chamberlain. As a crown receiver, his duties involved the collection of crown rents, both in cash and in kind, feudal casualties, fines and ascheats from the sheriff courts and the justice ayres and various othe items included in the 'farm of the shire'.[2] The sheriff was also responsible for raising of any special tax imposed by the king. His expenses were various and included the expenses of the king and his household when resident in the sheriff's locality, the expenses of royal castles,

---

1. Report of the Committee on Public Records. Kings Remembrancer's office Letter Bk. Vol 8, 195-221, Vol. 12, 176: Treasury Minute Bk. Vol 14, 344.
2. Bateson 'The Scottish King's Household'. Miscellany of Scot.Hist. Soc., ii, 24.

pensions, fees and gifts, and any surplus which emanated from these accounts was paid over to the king's chamberlain or a household officer.[3] Concerning the administration of the royal finances, the sheriff was required to execute the various writs which flowed from the king, his chamberlain or his council and these tended to range from supervising weights and measures to poinding crown debtors. In the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the sheriff was one of the most powerful officers under the crown.

The later Middle Ages witnessed several changes in the composition of the sheriff's accounts. Ther sheriff's fiscal jurisdiction was encroached upon from various angles, from the reign of James I the 'Ballivi ad Extra' assumed responsibility for a large majority of the kings landed patrimony.[4] Although the sheriff continued to be charged with the profits from feudal incidents and royal justice, the actual receipts from these sources increasingly fell to the Treasurer, during the reigns of James III and IV. By the reign of Alexander III, most of Scotland, except the extreme north and west, had been divided into shires. By the later fourteenth century, the development of regalities began to outstrip the shrieval system. In the reign of Robert II, a new order of regality was formed with the development of royal bailleries in the Steward territories of Cunningham, Carrick and Kyle and as the crown's landed estate expanded in the fifteenth century, Menteith, Strathearn, Annandale, Kirkcudbright and other areas also fell under this type of jurisdiction.[5] Over each of these jurisdictions, the king placed a baillie or steward, whose fiscal and administrative duties were no dissimilar from those of the sheriff.

---

3. ER, i, XLV. Dickinson, Sheriff Court Book of Fife, Scot. Hist. Soc., xlvii.
4. The first Ballivi ad Extra accounts were recorded in 1434, but since one of the accounts listed an arrears total it can be assumed that Ballivi ad Extra accounted for crown rents prior to that date although accounts have not survived. ER, iv, 589-597.
5. Malcolm, 'The Office of Sheriff in Scotland', SHR, xx, 290-i.

Although the Stewards of Annandale and Kirkcudbright, and the ballies of Kilbride and Cunningham accounted in the early rolls of the 'Ballivi ad Extra', in the mid fifteenth century, they were gradually removed from these rolls and entered in the sheriffs' rolls.[6] In the case of the earldom of Carrick, the offices of baillie and 'Ballivus ad Extra' were combined under Gilber, lord Kennedy.[7] But in the 1469 account of the earldom, lord Kennedy was created chamberlain of the king's lands in the earldom, being now responsible only for the farms of these lands, while his son, John Kennedy was, at the same time, constituted baillie of the Earldom and charged to collect the profits from wardship, marriage, relief, fines, escheats and court issues, now no longer charged to lord Kennedy.[8] This separation of the duties of baillie and chamberlain resulted in the disappearance of casualty and judicial payments from the accounts of the Carrick 'Ballivus ad Extra'.[9] The earl of Argyll acted as both chamberlain and baillie of the lands of Cowal, but in his latter capacity, his accounts were rendered in conjunction with his office as sheriff of Argyll.[10]

As early as 1305, the office of sheriff in Selkik, and Kinrose was heritable and those of Cromarty, Dumbarton and Roxburgh soon followed.[11]

		In the rolls of the Ballivi ad Extra	Accounted as sheriff
6.	Cunningham:	ER, vi, 428 (1458)	1479 ER, ix, 679.
	Kilbride :	ER, v, 414, vi, 441. (1450 & 1458)	
	Annandale :	From 1447 account to 1465 account ER, v, 357 to ER, vii, 308.	1492 ER, ix, 674.
	Kyle :	ER, iv, 594 (1434) vi, 43 (1455)	1475 ER, ix, 677.
	Kirkcudbright:	ER, vi, 262, 352, 448, 546 vii, 6, 312. (1465)	1464. ER, ix, 670.

7. ER, vii, 562.
8. ER, vii, 646.
9. In the 1488 account of John, lord Kennedy, as chamberlain of the earldom of Carrick, he was charged with £915-10/- worth of feudal casualties and yet sir David Kennedy was baillie of the earldom. It is possible that part of the amount was left over from when John was baillie of the earldom during the lifetime of his father, but that does not explain the total sum charged. ER, ix, 16. SRO. Inventory of Ailsa Muniments, 152.
10. ER, x, 570, xi, 183, 311.
11. Dickinson, The Sheriff Court Book of Fife, Scot. Hist. Soc., xx, xxxv.

Throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, several fee and heritage grants of the office of sheriff were recorded in the Register of the Great Seal. On the 25 May 1451, the office of the sheriff of Wigtown was granted to Andrew Agnew, a royal servant, for life, and to his son, on Andrew's death, in heritage, with the order of succession recorded on the failure of direct heirs.[12] The extent of the tenure of sheriffdoms in heritage was considerable, for, of the ninteen sheriffs who accounted in 1455-6 and 1501, twelve of the officers recorded family continuity.[13] However not all sheriffdoms were granted in fee. On the 26 June 1488, Patrick, lord Hailes was granted the office of sheriff principal of Edinburgh for seven years, while, on the 9 March 1472-3 sir John Ross of Halkhead was constituted sheriff of Linlithgow for the duration of his life only.[14] Some shefiffdoms revealed a considerable overturn of holders; from 1450 to 1501 the office of the sheriff of Edinburgh was held successively by James Crichton, earl of Moray, Alexander Ramsey of Dalhousie, William, Lord Crichton and Patrick,earl of Bothwell.[15] Although this trend to hereditary tenure continued throughout the late medieval period, it was to the crown's disadvantage. Punishment of a sheriff often proved extremely difficult and by necessity, varied according to whether the office was held in fee or for a specified period. In an act of 1488 concerning crown officers who had fought on the side of James III at Sauchieburn, those who held their office in heritage were to be removed for a period of three years and then resotred, but those whose holdings were in liferent or for a specific period were to lose their office completely.[16] Punishment for neglect of duty was also extremely difficult

---

12. RMS, ii, 447.
13. See Appendix No.A/1(j)
14. RMS, ii, 1742, 1112
15. See Appendix No.A/1(j)
16. APS, ii, 207.

in the case of hereditary sheriffs.[17]

Skene revealed the disadvantages of these hereditable tenures by stating that 'schireffs in this realme hes their offices given to them be the king in heritage..... quhilk is the cause of great enormities and wranges, be reason the schireffes being infeft heritablie, thinkis themselves sure of their office, and regairdis nocht the execution theirof'.[18]

The crown did bring statutory influence to bear on this abuse, the 1455 act stated that 'ther be na office in tyme tocum geffyn in fee and heritage, and that offices that are gevin sene the decease of our Soverane lorde that dede is be revokyt and annullyt', but it remained dead letter as hereditary tenures continued to florish.[19] As expected in an office of such prestige and standing as the sheriff, it tended to attract to upper ranks of lay society. The nobility was well represented with the earls of Argyll, Buchan, Bothwell, Crawford, Lennox and Huntly. However, many of the sheriffdoms were retained by members of the higher lairdly calls or the cadet branches of noble houses; Campbell of Loudoun in Ayr, Douglas of Cavers in Roxburgh, Menteith of Kers in Clackmannan, Crichton of Sanquar in Drumfries, and Hay of Yestir in Pebbles.[20] The office of sheriff tended to be occupied by members of families, who were already principal landowners in that particular area. There was considerable demand for the office of sheriff, especially if granted in heritage, since it greatly extended the influence and prestige of that family in the locality. The fifteenth century witnessed the construction of local baronial spheres of influence throughout Scotland, in which the prestige and power attached to the office of sheriff, the principal royal officer in the locality, was an indispensable addition to the establishment of regalities and burghs of barony and the utilization of bonds of manrent and kin relations. Because of their lofty position in

---

17. Dickinson, The Office of Sheriff in Scotland, SHR, xx, 291.
18. Skene, De Verborum Significatione, section of sheriffs.
19. APS, ii, 43.
20. See Appendix No.A/1(j)

society, deputies were frequently used to perform the more menial assignments of the office and when called upon to account at the Exchequer, many sheriffs did so through a deputy or procurator.[21] Although local landlords were anxious to acquire these offices, most sheriffs had neither the time, as many served the crown in other fields, nor the inclination to perform any but the major of his office.

The struggle over the office of the Stewardry of Strathearn between the houses of Drummond and Cargill and Murray of Tulibardine continued throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Not only did it reveal the interest aroused in the prestige and power attached to the office of sheriff, but also the manner in which the political climate affected the holder of the office. During the fifteenth century until 1488, the office appears to have alternated between the families, but, on the 28 July 1488, it was granted by James IV to John, lord Drummond, probably as reward for his services at Sauchieburn. Although sir William Murray seems to have queried Drummond's right to the office, the former's case probably collapsed on his failure to appear before the lords of the Council on 17 October 1495. In the 1501 account of the sheriffs, the stewardry of Strathearn was accounted for by

---

21. ER, vi, 171, 179, 185, xi, 301, 315

John, lord Drummond.[22] In fact, 1488 did result in some changes in the personnel of the sheriffs. Rebels, Patrick, earl of Bothwell, John lord Drummond and Andrew, lord Gray were, after the battle of Sauchieburn installed in the sheriffdoms of Edinburgh and Kirkcudbright, Strathearn and Forfar respectively.[23]

Although the revenue from the crown's landed patrimony was, in the fifteenth century, mostly the responsibility of the 'Ballivi ad Extra', certain sheriffs still accounted for small portions. The sheriffs' income from this source rose from £209-16-8 annually in 1456, to £318-5-7 in 1471 and finally to £329-16/- in 1501. The revenue from crown lands was of small amount when compared with gross charges of £1,999 in 1456 and £23,364 in 1501. As seen in the appendix, there was little continuity in the lands accounted for in these three years, in fact, only the lands of Cardross, Cumbrae and the annual rent from Cadzow, charged to the sheriff

---

22. History of the Stewardry of Strathearn:

Date	Holder	Duration
14 Feb 1408-9	Maurice Drummond	Heritage. (Fraser, Red Book of Menteith, ii, No.48)
Aug 1473	William Murray of Tulibardine (grant under the Privy Seal)	King's will. (Hist.Mss. Comm. 12th Report, Appendix Part 8, Duke of Athole, 8)
20 March 1473-4	John Drummond of Cargill, on the resignation of Maruice Drummond.	Heritage. (RMS,ii, 1160)
18 Jan 1482-3	Sir William Murray of Tulibardine.	Life. (RMS, ii, 1540)
28 July 1488	John, lord Drummond - This charter was registerd merely as a confirmation of No.1160, suggesting that charter dated 18 June 1482-3, was ignored:	Heritage. (RMS, ii, 1759)
1501	Account of the Steward of Strathearn - John, lord Drummond	ER, xi, 305.

ADA, 150 : ADC, ii, 390.

The civil action taken by sir William Murray in the 1490s many have been a foregone conclusion, especially since lord Drummond produced satisfactory charters, but there was a certain amount of confusion over the granting of the office, especially around the curious charter of 1473. Also there was considerable contact between the Montgomeries and Cunninghams for the bailliery of Cunningham.

23. See Appendix No.A/1(j)

of Dumbarton, survived for the entire period. The reasons behind certain portions of the crown property being accounted for by the local sheriff and not the 'Ballivi ad Extra' are obscure, but probably for the sake of convenience. As the keeper of the castle of Dumbarton was assigned the farms of the lands of Cardross, Cumbrae and the annual rent of Cadzow, at £86-13-4 in cash and 3 chalders, 2 bolls of barley, 5 chalders of oatmeal annually, it was probably more convenient for the sheriff of Dumbarton to handle these rents, as there was no other suitable financial officer since the lands were well scattered.[24] In the mid fifteenth century, the transfer of crown property from the sheriff's jurisdiction to that of the 'Ballivi an Extra' was not uncommon. In March 1473, the lordship of Bothwell, amounting to £132-5-7 annually, was removed from the responsibility of the sheriff of Lanark to that of Thomas Simpson of Knockhill as royal receiver.[25] Also when the barony of Roseneath was feued to Colin, earl of Argyll in January 1489-1490, he, as baillie of Cowal, became responsible for the collection of the farms replacing the sheriff of Dumbarton.[26] In 1501 the sheriff of Ayr was responsible for the collection of the farms of the lands of Trabboch and Terrenzean, charged annually at £120, yet, at the same time, John, lord Kennedy, chamberlain of Carrick, accounted for a further £20 rent from the lands of Trabboch.[27] Although on a much smaller scale than the 'Ballivi ad Extra', the sheriff was also involved in preserving crown estates from baronial interference. In 1455 the sheriff of Renfrew revealed an allowance in his account for the farms of the lands of Finnart for the last three years at £30, which, it

---

24. ER, xi, 342-3. : RSS, i, 2255.
25. ER, viii, 15, 174.
26. ER, xiii, 8 : RMS, ii, 1918.
27. ER, xi, 345, 334. These lands were situated just east of the burgh of Ayr and considerably north of the main block of the earldom of Carrick. Terrenzean had been granted, in April 1497 to sir John Ramsey for life, RMS, ii, 2341. Trabboch was formerly held by the earl of Douglas RMS, ii, 463.

was stated, had been removed by the late George Crichton. In response, the king contacted the sheriffs of Edinburgh and Perth to poind the goods and lands of his heir James Crichton, in order to recover the lost revenue.[28] The lands of Finnart were, granted to George Crichton, earl of Caithness in 1452,[29] but, in 1454, earl George was apparently urged to resign most of his recent acquisitions including the lands of Finnart, to the king, an arrangement to which his son James did not readily acquiesce.[30] From the evidence available, it would appear that the king was claiming the rents of the lands of Finnart from 1452 to 1455, and so ignoring the charter of July 1452.

The sheriff was also charged with certain annual levies from crown vassals, which, although consistantly present in the accounts, tended to be of small value. They appeared under the headings of blanch farms, annual rents and rents of assise or 'redditus assise'. These exactions, which sir William Purves termed 'proper casualty' as distinct from 'casual casualty' comprising of wardship, marriage non entry and relief formed only a small part of the sheriffs' income, in 1456, £47-7-10, in 1471 £57-10-10 and in 1501 £105-17-4.[31] Annual rents and rents of assise

---

28. ER, vi, 105-6.
29. RMS, ii, 587.
30. Paul, Scottish Peerage, ii, 329-30. James Crichton was probably mollified into accepting the arrangement by a royal grant of the lands of Strathurd in Perthshire. Auchinlek Chronicle, 13, 55. The last account in the Exchequer Rolls of Strathurd occurred in 1454 ER, v, 671. The 1456 accounts of the sheriffs of Edinburgh and Perth contained no reference to the distraint of James Crichton. In 1456 account of the sheriff of Dumbarton, there is an entry of the lands of Finnart, at a 20 marks annual farm. ER, vi, 154. James II seems to have regretted the rash grant to George Crichton in 1452 and attempted to retrieve the situation by forcing the pliant Crichton to resign his new concession, which included the lands of Finnart.
Dunlop, The Life and Times of James Kennedy, Bishop of St.Andrews, 149-50.
31. Purbes, Revenue of the Scottish Crown, 31. The 1501 total is larger than the two previous ones only because the accounts rendered that year were frequently of more than the one year's duration.

included certain cash payments from lands held of the crown by the service of ward and relief.[32] The situation is somewhat confused by a certain lack of consistancy in terminology; in the charge of the 1501 account of the sheriff of Aberdeen, the lands of Kinneff were liable for a payment of £32 in the name of feufarm, but later in the account, the same £32 was paid over to the comptroller, as being derived from the annual rent of Kinneff.[33] In essence the 'redditus assise' differed very little from the blanch farm.[34] Whereas the feufarm was a commercial tenure, where the land in question was rented for a 'competent avail', or for a farm approaching the true value of the land, blanchfarm did not possess such aspirations, but tended to be a fixed customary payment of small amount. Although some blanch returns occurred in the sheriffs' accounts, many were only payable if required 'si petatur tantum', which frequently meant only on the entry of the heir to the land when a double blanch was due.[35] In 1455 the sheriff of Kincardine was charged with 2 chalders of meal as double blanch farm of the lands of Leys and he was required to inform the auditors if the flanch was due annually and if, in the past, it exceeded one chalder of meal.[36] When charged in the sheriffs' rolls, it may have been in the form of a cash payment, in kind, or a cash commutation of a kind 'reddendo'. Cash payments tended to be small denominations of silver pennies. The

---

32. ER, vi, lxvi.
33. ER, xi, 365, 366. Also in the account of the sheriff of Kinloss, for 1456 the lands of Pulterland were charged at 10/- 'redditus assise' but in the discharge the land was declared to have been held in feufarm. ER, vi, 142, 144.
34. See Appendix No.B/6(f)
35. 'Censor', 'Blanch Holding', Judicial Review, 41, 340-1. Keldwood, in 1501, was charged at 1d blanch. ER, xi, 312. and in the same account was charged a double blanch of 2d on the entry of David Crawford to the lands. ER, xi, 313. However, the lands of Galloway were charged at 2 pounds of gingerbread as a double blanch on the entry of John, lord Oliphant to the lands, but the sheriff was not charged the single blanchfarm.
36. ER, vi, 84.

Barony of Prenderleith in Roxburghshire rendered one gold florin in 1455, while, in the same year, the sheriff of Lanark included two gold coins in his account.[37] By 1501 several silver or sterling blanchfarm payments were when paid over to the Comptroller converted into Scots currency. The Baillie of Cunningham paid 120 Scots to the comptroller for 4d silver blanch.[38] Payments in kind were as unusual as they were various, including gloves, spurs, crossbows, was, cumin, pepper, red roses, gum, broad headed arrows and others too numerous to mention.[39] Not unnaturally, these levies were often commuted to cash payment. A cash equivalent was arranged for every article likely to appear in the sheriff's accounts. During the period under consideration some articles retained a static price, between 1455 and 1501 a pair of gilt spurs and 1 pound of gum remained at 6/8 and 3d respectively, but some other commodities like pepper, rose from 1/- a pound in 1442, to 3/- and 3/4 in 1455 and finally to 5/- in 1489 and 1501.[40]

Castlewards were collected in the fifteen century only, by the sheriffs of Berwick, Edinburgh, Haddington, Lanark, Linlithgow and Roxburgh. The gross annual value of this source of revenue was £137-12-4, but £53-6-8 of that total was assigned to local friars in annual pensions.[41] Although

---

37. ER, vi, 95, 101.
38. ER, xi, 308.
39. 'Censor', 'Blench Holding', Judicial Review, 41, 344-9.
40. Gilt spurs: ER, vi, 86 : xi, 302. Gum.; ER, vi, 142. : ER, xi, 302. Pepper: SRO Yestir Writs, 76 : ER, vi, 86, 98 ; xi, 302. The trend reflected in the pepper commutation was also obvious in that of cumin, which between 1455 and 1501 rose in price from 8d to 1/4 a pound.
41. ER, viii, 1-41. Details from the sheriff's accounts of 1471.

Berwick	£22- 9/-	
Edinburgh	£22-10/-	
Haddington	£26-13/-	
Roxburgh	£39-3-4	
Lanark	£20-0-0	
Linlithgow	£ 6-16-8	ER, vi, 179-80.

The annuities to certain friars from castlewards were mostly of considerable antiquity. The pension to the Friar of Dundee from castlewards of Roxburgh stemmed from a concession of Robert I. ER, xi, 324.

castlewards, as their name suggests, were originally designed to provide for the maintenance of the castles of Edinburgh, Dunbar, Berwick, Blackness, Roxburgh and Lanark by the fifteenth century, it proved to be merely another source of crown revenue.[42] In 1501 the sheriff of Berwick was still charged with castlewards, amounting to £67-7/- for the last three years, yet, the castle of Berwick had long since passed into English hands.[43] Before 1465, the Berwickshire castlewards were charged to the chamberlain of March, and only after that date did the sheriff assume responsibility for them.[44]

Although steady sources of income, the above items were of small reward to the crown when compared to the main sources of the sheriff's revenue, namely the issues from feudal casualties and the profits of justice.

Essentially, feudal casualties became operative only on the occasion of the death of a vassel. On the death of the existing holder of an estate, a legal process was set in motion which resembled the English system of 'inquisitio post mortem'. The sheriff in whose shire the particular lands lay was served with a brieve of inquest, the various points of which were decided upon by a local jury. The points of the inquest questioned the conditions of the holding; namely whether the later vassal died 'vest and seised of the lands' and 'at faith and peace of the king', of what superior the lands were held, the nature of the holding, in whose hands the lands were at the time of the inquest and for how long, and whether the heir was of legal age. The valuation of the land according to old and new extent was also determined at the inquest.[45] The findings of

---

42. Purves, Revenue of the Scottish Crown, 34-5
43. ER, xi, 378.
44. ER, v, 487 : vii, 177, 316 : viii, 2.
45. Dickinson, Sheriff Court Book of Fife, 339-40 : Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, ii, 28-9. See Appendix No.B/6(e)

jury were embodied in a retour, which was then sent to the Chancery, whereupon, if the lands were held of the king, a precept of sasine was issued commanding the sheriff to give possession of the property to the new legal owner.[46]

Included in the retour were usually two or three valuations of the lands in question, 'old extent', 'in time of peace' and 'new extent'. The exact nature of the first two assessments is open to considerable doubt and there is no satisfactory explanation of their precise roles. By the fifteenth century, the mention of land valuation 'in time of peace' probably represented a long outdated assessment, in operation before the wars of Independance and which was in most cases, utterly divorced from fifteenth century values. During the fourteenth century, land valuations were affected by two features, firstly the constant political and military upheavals of the first half of the century tended to upset and distort old land valuations and secondly there was a substantial fall in the demand for real estate following the dramatic fall in population, which necessitated a reappraisal of land assessments. From these circumstances arose the need for a 'new extent', a valuation which was supposed to represent the true worth of an estate at the time of each retour. The assessment 'in time of peace' proved to be totally unrealistic in the fifteenth century and in the following century this valuation tended to disappear altogether from the retours. Although in many fifteenth century retours the value of a portion of land 'in time of peace' and 'old extent' might be similar, they were almost certainly distinct valuations. In a 1518 retour of service of Robert Maxwell to certain lands in the barony of Kilbride, the value of the lands in question were quoted at £50 'now' or 'new extent', 35 marks of 'old extent' and as much 'in time of peace'.[47] The phrasing of the retour

---

46. Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, iii, 29. : Hist.MSS. Commission, 12th Report, Appendix viii, Earl of Hume, 90-91.

47. Fraser, Cartulary of Pollok Maxwell, i, 234-5. In latin the phrase read, 'et antiqua extentu trigenta quinque, et tantum valent tempore pacis'.

assessment suggested that 'old extent' and 'in time of peace' were two separate reckonings which happened, in this particular occasion, to be of the same value. A feasible explanation of 'old extent' as expressed in Mediaeval retours, is that it represented the previous 'new extent', in other words, the last valuation of the lands in question which was now being superceded by a fresh 'new extent'. Hoever, 'old extent' and the valuation 'in time of peace' had little actual value in fifteenth century retours since the assessment on which value of the casualties of ward, non entry and relief were based was the 'new extent'.[48] By employing up to date valuations of estates, feudal incidents retained an economic appearance. In fact, by the terms of the 1474 Act of Parliament, it was stated that lands should be assessed at the 'werray awaill that it is worthe and gevis the day of the serving of the said breif'.[49] The alterations in the economic climate tended to be reflected in the nature of the relationship between valuations 'in time of peace' and 'old extent' on the one hand and 'new extent' valuations on the other. During most of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the fall in population, greatly exacerbated by the ravages of the Black Death, resulted in a severe decline in the demand for land, causing a corresponding fall in the value of real estate. Retours which have survived for the early part of the fifteenth century revealed that the 'new extent' valuation had tended to fall below that recorded 'in time of peace', that is, that the value of land in Scotland at this time was still below that of the thirteenth century or earlier. For instance, on 11 January 1423-4, in a retour of Luke Stirling, the lands of Raterne and others were assessed at 5 marks 'new extent' and 25 marks 'in time of peace' and similarly, in a retour of 29 April 1432 in a retour of William Stirling, the lands of Ragorton were valued at 14 marks 'new extent' and £10 'in time of peace'.[50] As the century progressed and

---

48. Thomas Thompson's memorial on Old Extent, ed. Mackie (Stair Society), 122-3.
49. APS, ii, 107.
50. Fraser, The Stirlings of Keir, 209-10.

the value of land tended to rise with the termination of demographic decline in Western Europe, the relationship between old and new valuations tended to narrow and even reverse. In two retours of 1487 to William Stirling, the lands of Cadder were recorded as being worth 85 marks both 'new extent' and 'in time of peace' while the lands of Lettir were valued at 20 marks by the former assessment and £10 by the latter.[51] A retour for Adam Hepburn who was served heir to the later Patrick, earl of Bothwell to the lands of the lordship of Liddesdale in 1508 assessed the value of the various lands within the lordship at £300 'now' or 'new extent' and only £100 'in time of peace'.[52] However, in January 1495-6 the retour valuation of the lands of the lordship of Eskdale amounted to £133-6-8 'now' and £200 'in time of peace', figures which may partly be explained by the close proximity of the lands to the English border at a time of friction between the two countries.[53] The 'new extent' valuation varied according to alterations in the assessed worth of the lands in question, and generally during the fifteenth century, land valuations tended to rise. For instance, in two retours to successive representatives of the family of Hay of Yestir dated 1478 and 1508, respectively the 'new extent' assessment for the lands of half the barony of Yestir, half the lands of Duncanlow, two thirds of Morham, half of Moscow, Ugston and a quarter of the lands of Blanis totalled £51-10/- at the former date, but by 1508, the up to date valuation had risen to £117-6-8. In most of these cases, land values had doubled, but, between the two dates mentioned above, the valuation of the lands of Ugston had been elevated from 10 marks to 40 marks.[54] However, there were occasions when the 'new extent' recorded in the retour did not in fact correspond to the actual

---

51. Ibid, 258-9

52. Fraser, Scotts of Buccleuch, ii, 111-2.

53. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 151.

54. SRO, The Calendar of Yestir Writs, 186, 309.

worth of the land. Attempts to defraud the superior of part of his profit from feudal incidents encouraged certain vassals to influence the inquest in order to gain an artificially reduced 'new extent' assessment on his lands. In 1492 Partick, earl of Bothwell brought an action for the reduction of a retour of James, lord Hamilton to the lands of Blairmuk since the jury had assessed the lands to be worth 40 marks 'new', which was similar to their valuation 'in time of peace'. Because the lords of the council discovered that the lands were actually worth £100 annually, the inquest was decreed to have erred 'becaus thai maid na devisioun in the said retour betwix the auld extent and the avale of the said landis that thai now giff according to the act of Parliament'.[55] The inquest was frequently the cause of administrative disruption and financial loss. It is likely that bribery and corruption played a large role in these inquests. In 1456 the ward of the lands of Eliok were not charged to the sheriff of Dumfries, and in addition it was stated that Robert Charteris was served as heir to the lands by Thomas Kilpatrick, then sheriff, and a 'favourable inquest'. The present sheriff was ordered by the king to summon the members of the inquest to answer for their illegal actions.[56] The sheriff and the members of these inquests were apparently not above a bribe and frequently employed various menas to distort the legal proceedings.[57] Undervaluation or ignorance of the true value of a portion of land was a common failure of these inquests. The sheriff of Lanark was ordered in 1456 to head an inquiry into the value of the lands of Dunsiar, formerly the possession of the earl of Ormond, for the purposes of distraint.[58] On the 13 February 1499-1500, the king pursued an action against Patrick Hamilton, sheriff depute of Ayr and the members of the jury who had served a brieve of chancery at the instance of John Crawford for the lands of Scheild nnd Drongane. The retour was

---

55. ADC, i, 154.

56. ER, vi, 168.

57. ADC. i, 34

58. ER, vi, 162.

declared cancelled as the lands had been assessed at £40 annually, but they were proved to be worth 100 marks at the present time, and the entire proceedings were described to have been 'in great harm to the king being overlord'.[59] Further, in 1490 Patrick earl of Bothwell instigated judicial proceedings against the jury which served on the brieve of inquest concerning the lands of George, earl of Rothes within the sheriffdom of Fife since they had assessed present value of the lands at £275 whereas they were actually worth £613-6-8.[60] Since the earl of Bothwell had been granted the relied of earl George's lands by the crown, both Bothwell and the crown would have suffered through the original assessment, Bothwell as he would have received a much undervalued year's rent as his relief and the king as the composition paid by Bothwell for the royal gift would have been proportionally reduced.

The 1469 retour of sir Duncan Grant, as heir to Gilbert of Glencairny in the lands of Cunygais in Invernesshire, demonstrated admirably the working arrangement between the retour and the fixing of a feudal incident. In the retour, the lands in question were valued at £2 'now' and 10 marks 'in time of peace' and it was also stated that they had been in the king's hands through non-entry for the previous thirty years. In the following precept of sasine, Duncan Grant was ordered to produce security for £60, the farm of the lands for the stated thirty years non-entry and a further £2 for the relief, assessments being based on the £2 'new extent' valuation.[61] Any change in the 'new extent' valuation tended to be recorded in the retour.

On 2 March 1511-2 an inquest held by the sheriff of Ayr declared that the lands of the late John Colquhoun of Balmacawell had been in the king's hands

---

59. ADC, ii, 393.

60. ADC, i, 269.

61. Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, iii, 28-9

through non-entry for the last 40 years and were valued in the following scale, namely £10-6-8 annually for the first ten years, £20-13-4 for the second period of ten years, and £31 for the final twenty years, thus making a total composite assessment of £930 for the entire period.[62] On the death of a crown vassal whose lands were held for the service of ward and relief, the casualty of wardship fell due on the occasion of the legal heir being unable to obtain infeftment to his estates on account of his minority. In the event of such an occurrance, the king, as feudal superior, assumed temporary control over the property in question until the heir attained his majority, unless a special dispensation was conceded to the countraty. In the 1456 account of the shefiff of Aberdeen, it was related that sasine had been given to John, earl of Ross since, by royal grace, the earl was allowed to enter his holdings while still a minor. The crown was entitled to the rents and other profits from estates for the entire duration of a minority.[63] Under the terms of feudal law, the king was bound to finance the upkeep of the heir for the duration of his minority and also to ensure that his estates were neither neglected nor excessively exploited. If a vassal died leaving an heir who was of age or on the occasion of a minor acheiving his majority, the superior retained the right to demand a relief, a form of entry fine amounting to one year's profits. Although there was little difference in the administration of wardship between Scotland and England, in the Later Middle Ages, the English method of calculating a relief ceased to be related to the value of the estate as in Scotland. In 1215 and 1297 the value of a relief payment was fixed by statute according to status, for successors to earldoms and lordships were required to pay £100 which was subsequently reduced to 100 marks.[64] There can be little doubt that the Scottish mode of assessment was economically more profitable. If the

---

62. RMS, ii, 3711.

63. ER, vi, 158.

64. Bean, The Decline of English Feudalism, 16.

lands in question were held in feuform, the vassal was requested to submit a double feu duty on his entry to the holding.[65] In the same way, the entry to the blanch holding included the payment of a double farm, The casualties of land and relief were due only from the lands held by that particular service.

The casualty of non entry was levied by a feudal superior when a vassal failed to gain legal entry to his estates, namely, when the latter had not obtained sasine by the due process of law. Theoretically, until the vassal gained legal recognition of his right to his property, the superior was entitled to retain the revenues of that estate, being not legally entered. The incident of non entry was in essence a legal device designed to arrest the loss of royal revenue since the casualty of relief and the composition due for the charter of confirmation could not be levied until the legal process of entry was undertaken. Although the profits from wardship could be collected by the superior annually, it was usual for the fine due from the process of non entry to be assessed on the occasion of the vassal seeking legal entry to the lands in question. Thus, during the period of non entry, the vassal normally remained in actual possession of the property, drawing all the revenues and profits as if legally infeft in the lands. Although the superior might fail to assert his right to the profits during the period of non entry, he always retained the legal right to claim the 'byrum' or backdated rents when the vassal eventually sought the instrument of sasine. For instance, in February 1468-9 an inquest declared that the lands of Connygais had been in non entry for the previous thirty years, namely since the death of Gilbert Grant of Glencairny, as the lands had not been recovered from the superior from Gilbert's death until the date of the inquest.[66] Since the lands of Connygais were valued at £2 'new extent', the king, as feudal superior, was entitled to claim a total of £60, the accumulated rent due from the lands during the past thirty years.

---

65. ER, xi, 360.

66. Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, iii, 29.

If the lands were declared to be in the superior's hands for a period of less than one year, but which included a term day, half the annual rent was due to the superior for non entry.

The feudal casualties recorded in the charge side of the sheriff's accounts were based on the detailes laid down in the Responde Books ('libri Responsiones'), which recorded a memorial of the precept of sasine. However until 1513, only the Minute Book of the 'Responsiones' going back as far as 1437 has survived and is printed in the Appendix of the ninth to the thirteenth volume of the Exchequer Rolls. In 1501 the casualties charged to the sheriff of Ayr during the previous year included £866-13-4 for the 13 year non entry of the lands of Grenane and £40 double feufarm on the occasion of the sasine being taken up by Thomas Davidson, 8 bolls of wheat and 2 pair of spurs for the double feufarm and blanchfarm respectively, levied when David Crawford was given sasine to his estates and £11 and 4d silver for the relief levied on the property of John Kennedy of Twynam within the shire, all of which were recorded in the index of the Responde Books for that year.[67]

Inevitably, by their very nature, feudal casualties provided the sheriff, and hence the crown, with a fluctuating source of income. For instance, the 1455 account of the sheriff of Fife recorded a gross casualty charge of £131-5-6, while a year later, in 1456, he was only responsible for £20, the non entry of the lands of Caskeb and Downfield.[68] Despite these obvious fluctuations, the charge side of the sheriff's accounts revealed a substantial increase in the extent of the crown's income from deudal casualties in the reign of James IV. In the 1456 and 1471 accounts of the sheriffs, the gross casualty income amounted to £1,120-4-4 and £627-5/- respectively, but by 1501, the sum had risen to the figure of £9,457-10-2.[69] This augmentation of gross casualty income recorded in the

---

67. ER, xi, 346 , 465-6.
68. ER, vi, 106, 148.
69. See Appendix No. B/6(c)

sheriffs' charge can be traced to four main causes. Firstly during the reign of James II and earlier part of that of James III, royal 'Ballivi ad Extra' tended to account for certain casualties. In the whitsun term account of the king's chamberlain North of the Spey, the accountant was charged with £32-10-4, for farms of the lands of Strathnairn, in the king's ward through the death of the earl of Crawford, and £144 for the rent of the lands of Arde, Strathglass and others, in ward through the death of Thomas Fraser, lord Lovat.[70] In 1454, Alexander Young, as chamberlain of the earldom of Mar was charged with £83-9-6 for wards, non entries and reliefs and in the same account, it was recorded that the earl of Huntly intromitted with the rents of the ward of the lands of Meldrum valued at 100 marks annually for the last three years.[71] It would appear from the above example, and several others of similar vein, that in the first half of the fifteenth century, baronial interference with the king's feudal rights was fairly widespread. There does seem to have existed a certain amount of administrative confusion as regards the collection of crown casualties. In the same account, there is an entry in the accountant's charges of 29/6 as the whitsun rent of the lands of Petfour, which were in the king's hands through non entry, but concerning the previous two terms, it was stated that Alexander Douglas, sheriff depute of Aberdeen, was held responsible for the farms.[72] Secondly, from the reign of James III, the concession or remission of certain feudal casualties as a form of patronage tended to be less pronounced in the interest of their fiscal contribution. Thirdly, as mentioned above, the relationship between the 'new extent' valuation, on which the value of feudal incidents was based, with the current

---

70. ER, vi, 214, 217.

71. ER, v, 654-5. It seems that the interfenence resulted in the demand for an inquiry since the entry was followed by the words 'consultendus est rex'.

72. ER, v, 654.

economic value of the estate concerned, resulted in an increase in the basic value of casualties. As the price of land began to rise in the latter part of the fifteenth century so also did the value of feudal indicents based on territorial estates. Finally, the evidence suggests that there was a conscious effort by the crown under James IV and V to exploit these feudal casualties to their fullest extent. However, more will be said on this score in the accounts of the treasurer, since, it is from these records, that this increase can be seen to the best advantage.

The ninefold increase in the gross casualty returns recorded in the sheriffs' accounts from 1456 to 1501 reflected in the crown's increased exploitation of this source of royal revenue. As far as the sheriffs' accounts are concerned, this can be seen to its best advantage in the figures relating to the casualties of ward and non-entry. As in England, wardship was regarded as the most profitable of the feudal casualties.[73] It tapped directly the wealth of an inheritance and often lasted for a considerable period. In England of the thirteenth century, escheaters were appointed to inquire into and enforce the crown's feudal rights.[74] In 1501, the gross income from these casualties amounted to £7,999-10-7, a total gross casualty return of £9,457-2-10.[75] Since it was the normal policy for the sheriff to account for these casualties only after the instrument of sasine had been taken up by the heir, the accounts are full of the accululated returns of wardships and non entries. This would appear to have been an administrative device employed to simplify the sheriffs' accounts. In the case of wardship, it was likely that the sheriff made annual receipt of the profits from these lands, but, only at the termination of the casualty, would any entry be made in the rolls.[76]

---

73. Non entry was a purely Scottish phenomenon and does not appear in England.
74. Bean, The Decline of English Feudalism, 16.
75. See Appendix No.B/6(d)
76. The arrangement for the collection of the profits of non-entry have been dealt with above.

The result of this fiscal arrangement was a series of large entries in the charge side of the sheriffs' accounts in 1501, the sheriff of Ayr was charged with £866-13-4 for the non entry of the lands of Grenane for the last 13 years, while the sheriff of Lanark accounted for £2,933-6-8 for the wardship of the barony of Avondale, in the king's hands for the last 10 years.[77] The ward of the lands of Dolphinstone was charged to the sheriff of Roxburgh at £280, the accumulated rent for the last 14 years.[78] In contrast the chamberlain of Moray accounted annually for the ward of Strathnairn.[79] Although many of the non entries recorded in the sheriffs' accounts were of long duration, there are also many of one term or one year.[80] The increase in the record of these types of non entries demonstrated that the king was eager to profit from short delays between the death of the previous owner and the taking of sasine by the heir. Also, although casualties were levied mostly on landed wealth, offices held in fee were also liable. In the 1501 account of the sheriff of Forfar, the charge contained a record of the three year non-entry of the office of coroner of Forfar and Kincardine, valued at £12 sterling or £42 Scots, which belonged to lord Glammis.[81]

As mentioned above, the profit derived from feudal casualties, as recorded in the sheriff's charge, increased dramatically during the fifteenth and early sixteen centuries. However, the augmentation in the sheriffs' gross receipts during the reign of James IV represented more an increase in paper work rather than physical expansion of the feudal incidents collected by that offical. For instance, out of total receipt

---

77. ER, xi, 346, 352.

78. ER, xi, 323.

79. ER vi, 214, 374, 462, 478, 513, 648, vii, 15, 122, 351. In 1466 the earl of Crawford received sasine of the lands ER, vii, 416.

80. ER, xi, 322-3

81. ER, xi, 331.

from casualties listed in the sheriffs' gross charge in 1501 of £9,457, £7,182 was immediately allowed to the various sheriffs in their discharges.[82] However, of the £2,275 remaining from the casualty charge of 1501, it is probable that a portion of this figure would be allowed to the sheriffs in future accounts, an arrangement which was frequently adopted.[83]

The principal casualty allowance originated from the practice of selling royal gifts of ward, non entry and relief. Even in the mid fifteenth century, casualty concessions were by no means uncommon. In the 1456 account of the sheriff of Dumfries, the ward of the lands of Amisfield Trailflat, Achnane and Coltynpane charged at £66-13/- and also the ward of the lands of Drumgrey charged at £34-6/-, were granted to Robert Carruthers and John Johnstone respectively for the entire duration of the casualty.[84] In 1471 the sheriff of Kincardine was not charged with the ward and relief due from the lands of Woodtown and Craigie and the annual rents from Morfy and Disclune following the death of Andrew, lord Gray as the king sold the casualties to the heir of the same name for a composition arranged with Thomas, bishop of Aberdeen.[85] In the same year, the baillie of Carrick was not held responsible for the ward of the lands of Culyane since the treasurer, John Laing, compounded with lord Kennedy for 50 marks for which the treasurer was to answer.[86] Yet, until the reign of James IV, this form of exploiting crown casualties was still in its infancy and many were still raised through the sheriff. But during the reigns of James IV and V there was a boom in the sale of feudal casualties. The increase was reflected in the Register of the Privy Seal, where, in 1501, 15 such concessions were recorded, while 10 years later, there were 23 such

---

82. ER, xi, 301-384
83. ER, xi, 335. The farms and relief of the barony of Philorth were charged to the sheriff of Aberdeen in 1493, and in the account of 1501 were allowed to the same sheriff as they had been conceded by James III to sir James Ogilvy of Deskford and William Keith.
84. ER, vi,170-1.
85. ER, viii, 19.
86. ER, viii, 20.

entries.[87] The effect of these concessions was, in effect, to remove the sheriff from the administration of feudal casualties. Although gifted wards, non entries and reliefs continued to be charged to the sheriff. This represented only paper work, since they were immediately allowed to the sheriff in his discharge, as being gifted by the crown and therefore no longer the sheriff's responsibility.

In fact, in the administration and exploitation of the more valuable crown casualties, the treasurer was seen to replace the sheriff. Even in the mid fifteenth century, suitors seeking the gift of crown casualties found it more convenient to treat directly with the treasurer. On the 31 July 1473, John, lord Darnley was granted a discharge by James III for the entire entry to the earldom of Lennox as he had delivered to the king, probably through his Treasurer, the full payment of a composition.[88] In the sheriff's accounts of 1471, there is also evidence of this trend. The sheriff of Aberdeen was allowed the relief of the lands of Cluny, Glenmuick and Glentanner, charged at £120, since the earl of Huntly had compounded with the Treasurer for the relief of all his lands in Scotland for the sum of 200 marks.[89]

By the time of the 1501 accounts of the sheriffs, this movement was in full swing. The largest gross casualty charge occurred in the account of the sheriff of Lanark, at £3,121-17-4. However, the same account also witnessed an equally large casualty allowance totalling £3,106-13-4, which adequately revealed the misleading nature of the figure recorded in the sheriffs' charge. The account included £2,933-6-8 for the ward of the barony of Avondale for 10 years, £66-13-4 for the ward of the lands of Busy, and £106-13-4 for the non-entry of the lands of upper and lower

---

87. RSS, i, 608-750 : 2175-2346. The year being taken from 1 January to 31 December.
88. Fraser, The Lennox Book, No.67. See Appendix for the details of the discharge.
89. ER, vi, 32.

Castletown and the lands of Gallowhill, all of which were allowed to the sheriff as they had been sold by the king to Colin, earl of Argyll, John Stewart and Alexander Stewart of Castlemilk respectively for a specific composition paid to the Treasurer.[90] The elimination of these fictitious charges reduced the sheriff's actual dealings in feudal casualties to a mere £15-4/-. The sole entry in casualty charge of the sheriff of Dumbarton, namely £621-13-4 for the 5 year ward of the barony of Lenzie, was immediately allowed to him as the casualty had been sold by the king to Archibald, earl of Angus.[91] Henry Mersar compounded with David Beaton, on behalf of the treasurer, for the relief of his own lands whereby he paid a composition of £120 for the total relief of £137-6-8 charged to the sheriff.[92] Not all casualties were allowed to the sheriff because of crown gifts. The non entry and double feu entry of the lands of Grenane, charged to the sheriff of Ayr at £906-13-4, were discharged from his account, as Elizabeth countess of Ross, had laid claim to the farms through a liferent concession from James III.[93] It would appear that the countess of Ross was actually receiving the revenue from the lands of Grenane, for she issued 2 discharges, one to Hugh Wallace in 1495 and the other to Thomas Davison in 1499, for the payment of £20 by each of them for one terms farm of the lands in question.[94]

The practice of selling royal wardships, non entries and reliefs was obviously beneficial to the crown. By circumventing the sheriff as the vehicle for the collection of casualty revenue, a greater degree of efficiency was achieved and also responsibility for the collection of the actual profit of the casualty shifted from the crown to the grantee of

---

90. ER, xi, 352 , 358-9 .
91. ER, xi, 342 , 344 .
92. ER, xi, 369 .
93. ER, xi, 350 . : RMS, ii, 1449.
94. SRO, Inventory of Ailsa Muniments, 9 Box 23 A.

the gift. By compounding for a sum smaller than the gross value of the casualty, the crown was more likely to achieve full payment. Although payment was due to the treasurer at the outset of the gift, it did not necessarily involve an immediate financial settlement, for payment by instalments was fairly common. The composition made with Henry Mersar for the relief of his lands in the 1501 account of the sheriff of Perth, it was recorded that David Beaton confessed receipt of 100 marks in cash, and for the remaining 80 marks, he had accepted Henry's obligation, thus deferring actual payment to a later date.[95] The account of Treasurer David Beaton in September 1507 demonstrated the extent of the outstanding casualty payments that had built up in the preceeding years.[96] Although it is probable that some were never paid, nevertheless, it seems fairly certain that the crown achieved a greater return from compounding for a casualty than from relying on the sheriff for collection. Inaddition, the crown now avoided liability for the various burdens of tithe, terce and other prescribed allowances which served to reduce the real value of the casualty. For instance, although the gross receipt from the ward of the lands of Mountblair and others formerly held by the earl of Buchan, amounted to £227-2-5, 17 chalders, 7 bolls of barley and 10 chalders of meal, the real income received by the comptroller was only £30. However, it would appear that the king used the farms of the ward for the purpose of patronage, for George Gordon of Midmar and his wife, Margaret were granted £19-13-4 and over 3 chalders of victuals from the farms of the ward for the duration of the casualty.[97]

By the terms achieved by the crown, it seems likely that there was considerable competition for these casualty gifts. Although it was normal procedure for the king to grant the ward or non entry of the entire landed possession of a particular individual, each sheriff's account dealt only

---

95. ER, xi, 369.

96. TA, iii, 213-228.

97. ER, xiii, 546-9.

with the lands involved within his own jurisdiction. The sheriff of Ayr received an allowance of £111-0-4 and 4d silver for the relief of the lands belonging to sir John Kennedy of Twynam since he had compounded with the treasurer for the sum of 500 marks and 4d silver for the relief of his entire possessions.[98] The steward of Kirkcudbright was charged with £250 for the non-entry and relief of the lands of Cardoness in 1501, but the treasurer and the compositors compounded with John Drunbar of Mochrum for the sum of £200, of which John paid 100 marks in cash and gave his obligation for the remaining 200 marks.[99] By this arrangement, the king lost only £50. Obviously, closer the composition total came to the gross sum charged to the sheriff the greater the competition for the gift. In other arrangements the king does not appear to have gained such good terms. In the account of the sheriff of Peebles, the farms of one third of the lands of Glen, charged in the 1499 account at £140, were gifted to Patrick, earl of Bothwell for a composition of £50 paid to David Beaton.[100] Although crown gifts of feudal casualties increased steadily in popularity, it must not be assumed that the sheriff lost complete control of this source of revenue. Indeed, he had lost a great deal of his influence in this sector, but, even in the 1501 account, certain sheriffs were still responsible for the payment of the fruits of certain casualties to the Treasurer. The sheriff of Kincardine submitted £20-5-6 for the farms and relief of the lands of Dulathy to David Beaton,[101] while the sheriff of Fife submitted £185-11-1 for the two year ward of the lands of Luchris and Cults directly to the Treasurer.[102] However, concerning the overall effect of the granting of royal gifts of casualties and the levying of compositions as the mode of payment, more will be mentioned in the chapter on the accounts of the Treasurer.

---

98. ER, xi, 348.
99. ER, xi, 384.
100. ER, xi, 310.
101. ER, xi, 367.
102. ER, xi, 364.

The accounts of certain lands held in ward appears in the accounts of the 'Ballivi ad Extra'. Where this was so, the sheriff, in whose jurisdiction the lands lay, would gain an allowance for the farms in question. In 1455 the sheriff of Kincardine, after an allowance of £26-13-4 for the relief of the lands of Montdevin, was to inquire from Thomas Sibbald, farmer of the lands in question, if he had satisfied the king or his comptroller concerning the payment of the relief, and if not, the sheriff was to be charged with the cash in his next account.[103]

In the fifteen century, this experiment was condensed into the period 1438 to 1463.[104] The accounts of the ward of the coalmine of Tranent and of the lands of Duchal in 1438 were the first examples and five other wards accounted in this manner by 1463, when the idea appears to have fallen into disuse. The experiment did not prove an outstanding success. The considerable gulf between the gross charge and the real income collected by the crown suggested that these ward accounts did not achieve a very high degree of administrative efficiency. Against the gross charge were set allowances for the terce, the expense of the administration of the estate and provision for the maintenance of the heir. Of the £800 charged to William Hay, as farmer of the baronies of Errol and Capet, only £389-13-4 found its way into the king's coffers, just under 50%.[105] However, other ward administrations met with even less success, for John Hog provost of the Coalmine of Tranent, in ward through the death of sir John Seaton, paid only £146-7-6 to the crown out of a gross charge of £722-7-1.[106] Although unsuccessful in the mid fifteenth century, the idea was nevertheless, repeated in the early sixteenth century when, on the death of Patrick, Lord Haliburton in 1505, James IV appointed

---

103. ER, vi, 84.
104. See Appendix No.B/6(a)
105. ER, v, 109.
106. ER, v, 52. £240-15-8 was paid over to the widow of sir John Seaton as her terce.

4 chamberlains to administer his lands, then in ward to the crown,[107] and a further two chamberlains dealt with the lands belonging to the deceased earl of Buchan.[108] Yet these later attempts proved to be as miserable failures as their predecessors. From 1506 to 1513, the lands of Haliburton yeilded an average annual return of £55-3-4 to the comptroller from an annual gross charge of £381-16-5, and the accountant, Richard Nicolson, amassed arrears of £823-5/- by the death of James IV. Similar failure can be seen in the administration of the lands of Auchterhouse, Eassie and Nevay, where the real annual revenue paid over to the crown fell from £175-0-2 in 1506 to £9-6-8 in 1513.[109] However, immediately after Flodden, the ward of the lands of the late Patrick, lord Haliburton were gifted to Alexander, lord Hume, while in 1517, the ward, relief, marriage and non entry of the lands of the late earl of Buchan were conceded to Isobelle Grey of Dudhope.[110]

In 1509, there is recorded in the accounts of the 'Ballivi ad Extra' the account of Thomas, lord Innermeath, as baillie of the barony of Balmain apprized to the king for a debt of £2,210 owed to the king through the non-entry of the earl of Rothes for 26 years. From the charge of £100-13-4 the Treasurer gained £60-16/-.[111] Yet, this account appears only to have a stopgap measure, for, in May 1510, the lands were conceded to sir John Ramsey of Terrenzeane, for which he paid a composition to the treasurer.[112] It is probable that the king realised that the latter course would bring the crown an immediate and more definite return.[113] In 1510 and 1512 there were two accounts of Andrew, bishop of Caithness as receiver of the

---

107. ER, xii, 422, 430, 431, 432.
108. ER, xii, 423, 435.
109. See Appendix No. B/6(a)
110. RSS, i, 2565, 2902.
111. ER, xiii, 195.
112. RMS, ii, 3460.
113. TA, iv, 151. 100 marks rest of the composition of sir John Ramsey for a charter of new infeftment of the lands of Balmain, apprized to the king.

lands of the earldom of Sutherland, in the hands of the crown through non entry.[114] In 1494 a brieve of idiotry was served on John, earl of Sutherland, and, as a result, he spent the remainder of his life under a tutor.[115] His son John, who succeeded to the estates in 1508, appears to have been of similar mental retardation, and through his incapacity to assert his legal title to the property the lands of the earldom fell to the crown through non entry.[116] The lands of the earldom of Sutherland remained in royal hands until the death of earl John in June 1514 when sasine to the estates was taken up by his sister Elizabeth and her husband Adam Gordon.

Certain feudal casualties were administered by receivers, appointed under the privy seal, who accounted directly to the treasurer.[117]

In the accounts of the sheriffs, there were several cases of casualties either not charged to the accountant, or immediately discharged to him in his account. The reasons for these losses were various, to baronial interference, sheer accident, administrative failure or ignorance of the workings of the feudal law on the part of the sheriff.

As mentioned before, baronial interference in the king's casualties was a pressing problem, especially, in the reigns of James II and III. In 1456, the sheriff of Renfrew informed the auditors that he had not been charged with the 4 year non-entry of the lands of Barrochan as William bishop of Glasgow, whom the sheriff asserted possessed the lands as a gift from the king, had granted them to the laird of Howiston. It is probable that the claim was in some way dubious as an inquiry was ordered.[118] The

---

114. ER, xiii, 263, 444.
115. ADC, i, 378-9. : TA, i, 221.
116. Fraser, The Sutherland Book, i, 71.
117. See Chapter on Treasurers' Accounts.
118. ER, vi, 153.

sheriff of Aberdeen was allowed the farms and relief of the lands of Agmaconan in the lordship of Meldrum valued at 80 marks, since they had been occupied by the earl of Huntly, who had since gained a royal remission for all his past interference in royal property during the Douglas crisis.[119] George Caverhill entered into possession of the lands of Abington and others in the barony of Crawfordjohn through a sasine conveyed to him by someone other than the sheriff, and the latter was ordered to distrain George for the lost revenue.[120] As with other parts of the crown's patrimony, its rights were being continually undermined from without and the sheriff was constantly called upon to reassert the position.

The forces of fortune also affected the sheriffs' accounts. In 1501, the sheriff of Perth was allowed £15 for the relief of the lands of Buttirgask, charged in the 1495 account, since the heir had died immediately after the sasine had been handed over to him and the sheriff has received no payment.[121]

Administrative confusion and legal ignorance were frequently the cause of temporary losses of revenue to the sheriff. Examples of these failures are frequent and of varying causes. In 1489, the sheriff of Edinburgh could not be charged with the relief of the lands of Inverleith, Garmilton and Dalry as the instruenent of sasine was dated after the account.[122] In 1456, the sheriff of Dumfries, confronted with the loss of £80 from the ward of a quarter of the lands of Tinwald, which had been suspended in the accounts for several years, and a denial by Edward Maxwell

---

119. ER, vi, 159, 266. This remission to the earl of Huntly, probably in return for his services to the crown during the crisis years of 1450-5, in fact, turned a blind eye to the earl's encroachments into the crown property in the north. Also included in the general remission, were the rents of certain lands in the earldom of Mar.
120. ER, vi, 162.
121. ER, xi, 371 .
122. 1489 Sheriff's accounts.

and his wife Margaret that they had taken any of the rents before their entry to the lands in question was ordered to inquire diligently into whom, in fact, had seized the rents, and meanwhile the loss remained unresolved.[123] The sheriff of Berwick informed the auditors that the farms of a tenenment in the territory of Bassendean had been received by sir William Cranstone of Corsby by virtue of a gift of ward, but since the letter of gift had not been produced, royal letters ordered him to distrain sir William for the rents.[124] If the heir failed to have the precept of sasine executed before the term day following its date, another term's non entry would normally be payable to the crown. On occasion, special dispensations were granted to heirs unable to enter their estates in time. In 1456, David Graham was released from further payment of a term's rent although he had not as yet recovered his sasine.[125] In 1513, through a royal letter to the sheriff of Dumbarton, the tenants of the earldom of Lennox were to pay their Martimas rents to earl John, and not the sheriff, as the earl is 'servit and retornit of hys landis, and becaus the terme of Mertinmes approchis sa nere that he can nocht gett his precéptis and sesing befor the said term'.[126]

The financial value of the feudal casualty was often reduced by the exaction of a terce or tenth penny. Whether the ward or non-entry was raised by the sheriff or granted out as a royal gift, the terce was still assigned, and often represented a serious loss of revenue to the crown. In 1438, out of a total charge of £722-7-1 for the ward of the Coalmines of Tranent, the widow of the deceased sir John Seaton, received a total of £240-15-8 as her terce.[127] The situation was even worse if both the landlord's widow and mother were drawing terces.[128] The tenth penny,

---

123. ER, vi, 169.
124. ER, vi, 184.
125. ER, vi, 275.
126. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, No.127.
127. ER, v, 52-3.
128. ER, vi, 141.

although more consistantly levied, normally represented a smaller loss to the crown. From the sheriffdom of Lanark in 1501, the local Dominican friars received £10 from the issues of the justice ayre and 20 marks from the castlewards. The tenth penny, which was levied on land rents, burgh mailles, feudal casualties, and the profits of justice, was automatically set aside from the gross levy with the entry 'dempto decimo denario debito'.[129] In 1436, James I ordered his Justiciar North of the Forth, and the sheriff and baillies of Perth to submit to the Abbey of Scone the second teinds due to the Abbey from the issues of the justice ayres, the sheriff's court, wards and reliefs inside the sheriffdom of Perth.[130] In 1441, from the two year ward of the lands of Errol, valued at £800, the bishop of St.Andrews, as commendator of Scone, was paid a total of £80.[131] Although certain ecclesiastics were legally entitled to the payment of the tenth penny of feudal casualties within certain sheriffdoms, occasionally legal proceedings were necessary to ensure actual payment. Before the lords of the Council in July 1477, John, bishop of Brechin asserted his claim to the tenth penny due from the lands of the earl of Rothes in the Mearns for the duration of the ward. The bishop's claim was upheld by the lords and James III sent a letter to the sheriff of Kincardine to distrain the lands of the earl for the payment.[132]

Lands held in feufarme involved a special arrangement. Although the sheriff might in theory be charged with the non entry of a feu holding the collection of the actual farm tended to be prerogative of the 'Ballivi ad Extra'.[133] On the heir's entry to a feu holding a double feufarm was payable, and, although this tended to be charged to the sheriff the latter

---

129. Sheriff's Accounts 1489.
130. Liber Ecclesie de Scon, No.198.
131. Registrum Episcopatus Brechinensis, i, No.96, 97.
132. ER, xi, 336.
133. 1489 Account of the Sheriffs.

received an allowance for the annual feufarm still accounted for the by 'Ballivi ad Extra'. In 1489, the sheriff of Edinburgh was charged with the double feu of £32 for entry ot the lands of Gosford, but received an allowance for half as the receiver of Ballincrieff was charged with the annual feufarm of £16.[134]

Although a vassal could achieve a remission of part of his casualty through arranging a composition with the Treasurer, total remission of a feudal exaction was rare. In fact, only when a vassal fell in battle in the service of his king did the possibility arise. Such a concession Robert I promised his followers before the battle of Bannockburn. A similar grant seems to have been in operation before the battle of Harlow in 1411. In an inquest concerning the succession to a third of the lands of Ledyntusche and Rothmais, since William Tulidef had been killed at the battle, his son, Andrew, was permitted to succeed to the lands as if he had been of age, although still a minor.[135] The other obvious occasion occurred after the battle of Flodden in 1513. The lack of sheriff's accounts for the period immediately after the battle of Flodden make it impossible to assess the scope and extent of this arrangement. However, in a surviving account of the sheriff of Perth, the farms and reliefs of the lands of Rattray, Innerquhorsk, Murthly, Dalkerne, Dallmay and Leonach, belonging to Griselle and Elizabeth Rattray were remitted under the terms of a statute passed by the king and his lords in the field before Flodden,

---

134. The terce was equivalent to one third of the total gross casualty and was paid over to the widow of the deceased landholder. In 1456 and 1471 this was an automatic deduction, but by 1501 it was only allowed to the sheriff on cases where he had actually to collect the casualty. The tenth penny was paid to certain ecclesiastics, namely the bishop of Aberdeen, and Brechin, the abbots of Scone, prior of Restenneth and abbot of Holyrood, and was levied on all casualties and justice issues within certain sheriffdoms at the rate of 10%.

135. Registrum Episcopatus Aberd onensis, i, 214-5. Fraser, Red Book of Menteith, i, 218.

whereby the heirs of those who died in the king's service at the battle were not liable to the levy of ward, non entry, and relief.[136] Since the sister's grandfather had died at the battle, the feudal indicents charged to the sheriff at £618 were automatically discharged through this general remission.

The casualty of marriage, was usually sold along with the ward and recogntion tened to be settled through a composition paid to the king's Treasurer.

The second principal source of revenue included in the sheriffs' accounts was derived from the issues of royal justice. As the sheriff was charged with feudal casualties according to entries in the Responde Books, in similar vein he was charged with the issues of the justice and chamberlain ayres according to the extract of the proceedings sent to the sheriff after the termination of the actual ayre, which he was required to transport with him to the Exchequer. The brieve of summons sent to the sheriff of Aberdeen in 1437 recorded that apart from bringing with him the farms and returns wardship and relief, marriage, fines and escheats from the sheriff court collected since the termination of his last account, he was also to carry with him an extract of the justice and chamberlain ayres.[137]

Concerning the financial side of the justice ayres, the sheriff was responsible for the collection of unlaws and fines based on the findings of the extract. Apart from those levied for criminal offences, unlaws were incurred by landholders who failed to give suit and presence, as specified in their charters.[138] Unlaws were also levied on persons who

---

136. SRO Octertyre Papers, G.D. 54/2/ 219.

137. SRO, Lord Forbes Papers, 1. Also see Appendix No. There is another example of the summons of the sheriff to the Exchequer to account for his returns, in the Yestir Writs, 180.

138. Those tenants in chief, whol held their lands in blanchferme were exempt from this exaction. Dickinson, Sheriff Court Book of Fife, lxxiii-lxxxi. ER, xi, 357 .

had failed to present indicated persons for whom they were acting as legal pledge. The latter were mostly men of influence, feudal magnates, crown officers of clan chiefs, under an obligation for the good behaviour of those under their influence.[139]

As with feudal casualties, the crown found it expedient to adopt the policy of compounding. As the total justice ayre charge was probably unattainable, it was more profitable for the crown to accept the more certain exaction of a composition. This was facilitated by the crown's attempt to narrow the responsibility for payment of these fines and unlaws to a small number of influential men, leaving them the task of collecting the actual levies from the inhabitants of their particular locality. As a result, on the ayre, the justiciar was always accompanied by the Treasurer and two lords Componitors, who concluded the terms of the various compositions. On the successful conclusion of arrangements for the payment of a composition, a remission was issued, releaving those convicted of their penalties. This expedient appears to have been a popular measure. Letters of remission appear frequently in the surviving records of family muniments and official government records. The letters of remission varied considerabley in form and scope, ranging from the specific to the very general, from dealing with large sums of money to fairly small payments. On the 26 June 1498, sir John Wemyss entered into an agreement with the Treasurer for the payment of a composition of 100 marks for his failure to produce Robert Melville at the last justice ayre at Couper. This charter is especially interesting for the arrangements made for the payment of the sum demanded. Sir John was given until next Martinmas to

---

139. ER, xi, 326. Patrick, earl of Bothwell acted as pledge for certain persons of Liddesdale for two justice aures and for fines and unlaws totalling £1,100. The earl of Bothwell was granted the lands of the lordship of Liddesdale on 6 March 1491-2, and was thus in a position to act as pledge for the inhabitants. RMS, ii, 2092. : Fraser, Douglas Book, iii, No.127.

pay the sum arranged, and as security, he was to put up two salt pans belonging to him in Wemyss.[140] On the 17 April 1499, George, master of Angus entered into an indenture with the king's treasurer in which the earl was bound to pay a composition to the latter for a remission granted by the king to the inhabitants of Eskdale, Ewedale, and Wauchopdale for all the crimes committed by them before the date of this indenture. Although bound under the terms of the indenture, to pay £1000 to the treasurer, in the event of propt payment of a 1000 marks in two equal instalments, the rest was to be remitted, but failure to achieve this was to result in the full payment being demanded. The earl further engaged to bring all those persons within the district who had contravened the law to justice.[141] Several leading landowners appear to have entered into similar arrangements with the Treasurer and for those persons under their jurisdiction received a royal remission.[142] Similar remissions might also be granted to burghs to secure release from the fines incurred at the justice and the chamberlain ayres.[143] In addition, remissions were granted to individuals for particular crimes. On the 10 February 1488-9, William Douglas of Cavers and other inhabitants of the shire of Roxburgh gained a remission for their treasonable appearance against James IV at Sauchieburn, while on the 12 February a year later, John earl of Lennox purchased a remission for himself and others for the burning of the burgh of Dumbarton and the capturing of the burgh.[144] Parliament in the reigns of James II and III made continual

---

140. SRO, Makgill Charters, 40

141. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, No.151

142. Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, ii, No.62, 63. : SRO Calendar of Gordon Castle Manuscripts, 21. : RSS, i, 697. : SRO Mey Charters, G.D. 96/1; The last entry related an instrument to William, earl of Caithness stating that 'although he became a pledge to the king in his books of composition for the compositions of the remissions of his tenants and servitors in Caithness, nevertheless he denied intromitting with any goods of the said persons for the said compositions and protested that whatever Andrew, bishop of Caithness might do concerning the distraint of the said tenants, and their goods for the said compositions and whatever the lords of the king's council might do to the hurt of his heritage, should not harm him in the future'.

143. RSS, i, 2385.

144. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 86. Hist. M.SS. Comm.7th Report,Part ii No.18.

pay the sum arranged, and as security, he was to put up two salt pans belonging to him in Wemyss.[140] On the 17 April 1499, George, master of Angus entered into an indenture with the king's treasurer in which the earl was bound to pay a composition to the latter for a remission granted by the king to the inhabitants of Eskdale, Ewedale, and Wauchopdale for all the crimes committed by them before the date of this indenture. Although bound under the terms of the indenture, to pay £1000 to the treasurer, in the event of propt payment of a 1000 marks in two equal instalments, the rest was to be remitted, but failure to achieve this was to result in the full payment being demanded. The earl further engaged to bring all those persons within the district who had contravened the law to justice.[141] Several leading landowners appear to have entered into similar arrangements with the Treasurer and for those persons under their jurisdiction received a royal remission.[142] Similar remissions might also be granted to burghs to secure release from the fines incurred at the justice and the chamberlain ayres.[143] In addition, remissions were granted to individuals for particular crimes. On the 10 February 1488-9, William Douglas of Cavers and other inhabitants of the shire of Roxburgh gained a remission for their treasonable appearance against James IV at Sauchieburn, while on the 12 February a year later, John earl of Lennox purchased a remission for himself and others for the burning of the burgh of Dumbarton and the capturing of the burgh.[144] Parliament in the reigns of James II and III made continual

---

140. SRO, Makgill Charters, 40

141. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, No.151

142. Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, ii, No.62, 63. : SRO Calendar of Gordon Castle Manuscripts, 21. : RSS, i, 697. : SRO Mey Charters, G.D. 96/13 The last entry related an instrument to William, earl of Caithness stating that 'although he became a pledge to the king in his books of composition for the compositions of the remissions of his tenants and servitors in Caithness, nevertheless he denied intromitting with any goods of the said persons for the said compositions and protested that whatever Andrew, bishop of Caithness might do concerning the distraint of the said tenants, and their goods for the said compositions and whatever the lords of the king's council might do to the hurt of his heritage, should not harm him in the future'.

143. RSS, i, 2385.

144. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 86. Hist. M.SS. Comm.7th Report,Part ii No.18.

reference to the iniquities surrounding the frequent granting of remissions by the crown to tresspassers.[145] In 1487, Parliament bemoaned that 'his realme is greitly brokin in the self his leigis troublit and heryit throw tresoun slauchter reif birning thift and poin heirschip throw default of scharpe executioun of justice and ouer commoun granting of grace and remissiounis to traspassouris' and ordered that such grants were to be restrained for seven years.[146] This edict seems to have dropped out of the legislative records during the reign of James IV.

Remissions might involve the settlement of large sums of money. On 26 October 1500 Partrick, earl of Bothwell received a royal letter of remittance under the privy seal for the following payments, £1,100 for the fines of two justice ayres held in 1498 and 1499, £853-6-8 for which the earl was pledge for certain named persons whom he was to bring before the king at Stirling tolbooth, amounting to total revenue of £1,953-6-8. However in return for services performed and expenses incurred, the earl received quittance of the sum and various sheriffs were ordered to halt their processes for distraining the goods and the lands of the earl for the sum.[147] The first remittance of £1,100 was also recorded in the discharge side of the account of the sheriff of Roxburgh, in which Patrick, earl of Bothwell was remitted the said sum for which he had acted as pledge for certain persons in Liddesdale.[148] Further, on 17 September 1511, the Register of the Great Seal recorded a letter of assignation to Adam, earl of Bothwell from James IV, by which the former was remitted certain sums of money, totalling £13,274-15-4. This sum included the rests from the accounts of the sheriffdoms of Edinburgh and Haddington and the justice ayre of Berwick, along with £11,870-13-4 from the 1503 ayre of Dumfries, incurred

---

145. APS, ii, 33, 50, 118, 176.

146, APS, ii, 176.

147. RSS, i, 587.

148. ER, xi, 326 .

by the earl as security for the entry to court of certain men from Annandale.[149] Ther is no evidence in the surviving treasurer's accounts of any composition paid by the earl of Bothwell for the outstanding sums. The gross charge to the sheriff from the issues of the justice ayre rose dramatically from the reign of James III to that of his son. In 1456 and 1471, the gross return amounted to only £248 and £305-13-4, but in the 1501 accounts, the sheriffs were in theory responsible for a total of £8,892-13-4.[150] The justice ayre returns for individual sheriffdoms varied considerably in extent. The Selkirk ayre of 1500, held by the later George earl of Huntly contributed an issue of only £96-6-8, while the two Roxburgh aures of 1498 and 1499 returned sums of £2,455-13-4 and £2,015 respectively.[151] With the increase of royal presence and administration in the highland and border regions, the results were reflected in the upsurge of judicial revenue from these areas. In the 1501 sheriffs' accounts, substantial returns were recorded from the ayres of Inverness, Roxburgh, Lanark, Renfrew and Banff, areas fairly distant from the influence of the central government. The stimulus given to the itinerant justice aures by the frequent presence of James IV must have increased the efficiency of that institution and, in consequence, augmented the financial profit emanating from this source. This trend is even more noticeable in the Treasurer's accounts of compositions from the various ayres.[152]

---

149. RMS, ii, 3645.

£ 181-2/-	the rest of the account of the sheriff of Edinburgh, rendered in 1511.
£23.	ibid, for the account of the sheriffdom of Haddington.
£ 1,200.	Rest from the issues of 'justice ayres of Berwick and bailliery' of Lauderdale.
£11,870-13-4	Judged against the earl in the justice ayre of Dumfries in 1503 as the earl acted as pledge for the entry to court of certain persons from Annandale.

150. See Appendix No. B/6(c)

151. ER, xi, 320 , 324.

152. See chapter on the Treasurer's Accounts.

As with feudal casualties, the gross charges from the issues of the various justice ayres were very misleading. On the 10 June 1498, James IV issues signet letters to the sheriffs of Inverness, Banff, Elgin and Forres, charging them to desist from distraining John Grant of Freuchy for certain sums owed by him from the latest ayres in these shires for the non compearnace of himself and other persons at the ayres. It was stated that the sums were to be remitted to John on payment of a composition of 400 marks to the Treasurer and for his services in the capturing of Alan More McKewin and his accomplices in the Brae of Mar, and 'the hale somez contenit in the saidis extretis sall be allowit to yow the sheriffs in your compt, ye bringand the authentik copy of thir oure letteris for your warrand, delivering the samyn be yow sene and understandin againe to the berar to schaw in oure chekkar'.[153] In the sheriff's accounts of 1501, the allowances are duly recorded, £333-6-8 to the sheriff of Inverness, £166 to the sheriff of Forres and Elgin, and £300 to the sheriff of Banff, totalling £799-6-8 remitted to John Grant under the auspices of his composition with the Treasurer.[154] From the £4,470-13-4 charged to the sheriff of Roxburgh from the issues of 2 justice ayres, £1,854 was allowed to the accountant as remissions and compositions, and only £25 was paid directly to the Treasurer from these unlaws, the remainder forming part of the large arrear total of £3,968-1-7.[155] The true effect of these allowances is somewhat obscured by the fact that many compositions and remissions might still be allowed to the sheriff in accounts long after the original charge. However, allowances from the justice ayre charge were granted for several other reasons. Frequently the responsibility for the collection of sums of money were transferred from one sheriff to another. In 1401, in the account of the sheriff of Dumfries, George,

---

153. Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, iii, No.50.

154. ER, xi, 317 , 333 , 376.

155. ER, xi, 321-330.

Master of Angus was fined £3,250 in his role as pledge for the inhabitants of the lordships of Eskdale and Ewisdale, but since George had neither lands nor goods in that sheriffdom an indenture was sent to the sheriff of Berwick in whose Baillery George possessed property to distrain him for the sums owing.[156] Acceptance of an indenture of this nature does not seem to have been automatic, as the same sheriff of Drumfries refused to accept an indenture transmitted to him by the sheriff of Lanark.[157] In 1501, the laird of Cumnock was fined £10 for failure to give suit, but the lord Auditors discovered that his lands were held in blanchfarm with the result that no suit was due by the laird.[158] George Maxwell, James Hamilton, George Lindsay and John Bannachtyne were all fined £10 for not having given suit for their lands, but the sums were remitted on the subsequent occasions of their performing this task.[159] In 1472, John, lord Darnley, as sheriff of Bute, compounded for the issues of four justice ayres within his jurisdiction, payment £100 to the Treasurer.[160] The issues of justice ayres in som districts were subject to the levying of the 10th panny.[161] Thus for various reasons the actual cash that passed through the sheriff's hands from this source must have been of small monent compared with the sums with which he was charged.

Other judcial returns handled by the sheriff tended to be haphazard by nature and insignificant in extent. The chamberlain ayre issues were charged to the sheriffs in 1456 and 1471, at aggregate totals of £44-4-10 and £134, and, in common with the issues of the justice ayres, were charged according to an extract of the proceedings sent to the sheriff after the actual ayre. However, after 1471, the issues of the chamberlain ayres disappeared from the accounts of the sheriffs.

---

156. ER, xi, 313, 379
157. ER, xi, 360 , 379.
158. ER, xi, 349.
159. ER, xi, 357.
160. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, No.60
161. ER, xi, 376 .

With the increase in judicial activity under James IV, the returns for escheats appear to have followed an upward trend. In 1456 and 1471, escheats charged to the sheriffs totalled £38-18-8 and £7-7-8 respectively, but by 1501, the total had risen to £237-4-7.[162] However, not all escheats were commuted to cash, for in the 1489 account of the sheriff of Edinburgh, his arrears included '2 aumbries, 1 kist, 1 rick of oats, 140 sheep, 20 oxen, 1 cow, 2 couch beds with curtains, 1 chimney, 1 meatboard, 2 horses, 2 feather beds, with other utensils intromitted with by the coroner'.[163] Generally the escheats charged to the sheriff were confined to livestock and grain. In 1456 the sheriff of Lanark was charged with the escheats of malefactors consisting of 5 oxen 'cum le stot', 4 cows 1 chalder of oats and 2 acres of sown grain.[164] In the 1501 account of the sheriff of Lanark, the escheat total amounted to £102-6-8, but since it involved 23 persons the individual totals tended to be small.[165] However, the escheated goods of the earl of Rothes within the earldom of Fife, totalled £40.[166] Escheats were due to the crown from those hanged at the justice ayre and other courts,[167] those at the king's horn,[168] bastards who died unlegitimated and without lawful heirs of their bodies,[169] and suicides.[170] In 1465 the horse of Thomas Murray was declared escheated to the crown since it caused Thomas's death by drowning in the water of Lochir,[171] but in 1481-2, the horse on which Thomas Bullock was riding when he was drowned in the water of Aven was not escheated since he was drowned through 'his own folly and rashness.....and not the fault of the horse'.[172]

---

162. Appendix No.B/6(c)

163. Sheriffs' Accounts, 1489.

164. ER, vi, 160. A 'stot' was a young stear of bullock

165. ER, xi, 353-4 .

166. ER, xi, 363 .

167. ER, vi, 88, 354.

168. ER, xi, 331 .

169. ER, vi, 171, 264.

170. ER, xi, 375 . £31, the escheat of John Innes who drowned himself.

171. ER, vii, 309.

172. ADC, ii, c.

However the sheriff dealt with only a small proportion of the crown escheats. The Register of the Privy Seal and the Treasurer's Accounts recorded the extent to which crown escheats were sold. Again transactions were conducted with the Treasurer without passing through the sheriff's accounts.

The sheriff was charged with the issues of his own court, based, in theory on his own court book. It would appear that there was a certain reluctance on the part of the sheriff to declare these issues, for, in 1455, the sheriff of Renfrew was ordered to account for the fines on pain of loss of office.[173] The overall total from this source did not vary to any extent, but individual contributions fluctuated considerably. The returns from the sheriff court of Kincardine for the years 1456, 1471, 1501 ranged from £12, to £3-10/- to £4.[174] In 1501, eight sheriffs rendered returns of £2-14/- for the issues of their own court. It would appear that these sheriffs compounded for these profits. But when the baillie of Cunningham and the sheriff of Wigtown were ordered to show their court books at the next Exchequer, it suggested that these officers had not declared their total receipts.[175] Various other items occasionally appeared in the sheriff's charge. Normally insignificant, they included Exchequer fines of £10, levied on the occasion of the sheriff failing to render his account,[176] the burgh farms of small royal burghs namely Lochmaben, which later appeared in the rolls of the burgh baillies,[177] and the small burgh

---

173. ER, vi, 105.
174. Appendix No.B/6(d)
175. ER, xi, 307 , 339 .
176. Appendix No. B/6(d)
177. ER, xi, 341 . In the Steward of Annandale's account, an inquiry was ordered into the value of the burgh mailles and the burgh baillies were ordered to account for the fermes in the Exchequer in their own right. 1507 the burgh accounts were recorded in the burgh baillies rolls (ER, xii, 607.)

customs and burgh farms of Lauder.[178] Throughout the fifteenth century, the provost of Perth rendered his account as sheriff of Perth within the burgh, and the only item to appear in his charge was the customs of unbroken horses.[179]

The major item in the discharge side of the sheriffs' accounts undoubtedly consisted of the allowances granted for remissions and compositions arising from judicial action and feudal casualties. However, other items, of much inferior value, were submitted out of the sheriffs' returns. As mentioned above, payments to ecclesiastics, in the form of concessions and the tenth penny, which tended to be of considerable antiquity. Concerning the former, these annual grants were normally derived from the issues of the justice ayres, feudal incidents and from the levy of castlewards.[180] From the sheriffdom of Lanark in 1501, the local Dominican friars received £10 from the issues of justice ayre and 20 marks from the castlewards. Administrative costs ranked fairly high on the sheriffs' discharge. The expenses surrounding the justice ayre proved to be a heavy burden on the sheriff. In the 1489 account of the sheriff of Edinburgh, out of ayre charge of £328, the expenses of the justiciar amounted to £133-16-3, and those of the clerks receiving indictments at Hathintone on three occasions to £4-12/-.[181] In 1471, the total expenses of the justice ayres incurred by the sheriffs amounted to £144-1-6.[182] Such expenses were, in the early sixteenth century sustained by the treasurer.[183] Concerning the sheriff's own fee, Skene asserted that the sheriff, 'suld have for his fee of the escheittis, ten pundes'.[184]

---

178. 1489 Sheriffs' Accounts.
179. ER, v, 76, 106, 142, 245, 280, vi, 88, 149, xi, 303-4.
180. ER, xi, 355, 358.
181. Sheriffs' Accounts 1489.
182. ER, viii, 3, 22, 34, 36, 37.
183. TA, ii, 298, 300.
184. Sir John Skens, De Verborum Significatione, Schireff

Although, in theory this statement may have been true, in practice, the fees paid to the sheriff appear to have varied considerably in extent. In 1501 the sheriff of Inverness was paid the full £10 from the issues of his own court.[185] In many accounts the question of the sheriff's fee was never mentioned, while in the 1456 account of the sheriff of Stirling, it was declared not to be allowed to him.[186] Many sheriffs received partial payment of anything under £10. In the terms of a royal confirmation of James IV, the earl of Argyle was to be allowed half of the escheats and fines of his court as hereditary sheriff of Argyll and half the fees and casualties from his heritable office as coroner.[187] In 1471 the earl received a payment of £1 as half of the amount collected from the issues of his court under the terms of that concession.[188] In common with other border crown financial officials, the sheriffs' accounts suffered periodically from being in close proximity to England. In 1501, for the three years of the account of the sheriffdom of Berwick, certain lands were declared waste, causing a loss of revenue of £46-17-4.[189] Finally, the sheriff was required to make several incidental payments from his account. These payments frequently bore no relation to the sheriffs' accounts and appear to have been arbitrarily selected. In 1455, the sheriff of Fife received an allowance of £20 for the purchase of a horse from himself for the king.[190] In 1489, the sheriff of Perth paid Arthur Oliphant £20 for the damage and injury he sustained at the chase at Stirling,[191] while the Steward of Kirkcudbright received an allowance of £5 to repair the house of John McAuvel, which had caught fire during the king's visit to Tungland.[192]

---

185. ER, xi, 317 .
186. ER, vi, 166.
187. Hist. Mss. Comm., 4th Report, Duke of Argyll manuscripts, 476.
188. ER, viii, 21.
189. ER, xi, 380 .
190. ER, xi, 108.
191. 1489 Sheriffs' Accounts.
192. 1489 Sheriffs' Accounts.

As well as reparation for damage resulting from the king's presence or sustained in royal service, local building programmes received resonable endowments. Master William Turnbull, rector of Annand, was to receive £30 for the repair of a small tower or belfry near the church of Annand.[193] It seems that throught the fifteenth century, the issues of the accounts of the sheriff within the burgh of Perth was used totally for the repair of the bridge over the Tay.[194]

There is little doubt that an immense gulf existed between the sheriffs' gross charge and the real revenue, which he was able to pay over to the king. On paper, the sheriffs' accounts revealed a dramatic increase in the amount of gross receipts between the mid fifteenth century and the early sixteenth century. The total charges of the 1456 and 1471 accounts totalled £2,008-16-7 and £1,728-15-4 respectively, whereas, in 1501, the total had risen to £23,364-7-.-3.[195] However, the sheriffs acutally handled only a small proportion of these figures. With reference to the above three years, the amount of money which, in fact, found its way into crown coffers through the sheriff consisted of only £155-1/-, £964-3-6, and £2,044-15-2. These payments which represented the real profit derived by the crown from the sheriffs' accounts, consisted of only 4%, 30% and 5% of the sheriffs' gross charge.[196]

Beyond the items listed in the charge side of the sheriffs' account, which could be equated with actual receipts, there is little evidence of the physical transmission of money. However, on 10 March 1434-5, sir William Crichton, master of the king's household and sheriff of Edinburgh issued a letter of discharge to David Hay of Yestir for £212-15-4 for his relief. This obviously did not make up full payment for the casualty, for at the foot of the letter an appended note related that £19-15-4 still remained owing to the sheriff.[197] The individual accounts of the

---

193. 1489 Sheriffs' Accounts.
194. ER, v, 77, xi, 304 . Through a concession of Robert III
195. Appendix No. B/6(c)
196. Appendix No. B/6(c)
197. SRO. Calendar of Yestir Writs. 64.

sheriffs reflected further this movement. The 1501 account of the sheriff of Berwick revealed a total charges of £4,280-15-2, of which £727-7-4 was recorded in allowances to the sheriff, £3,553-7-9 as his arrears, and he had paid nothing direct to the king or his representatives. The other accounts recorded similar trends.[198]

Basically, there are two reasons for these large discrepancies. Firstly, as mentioned before, the increasing scale of crown gifts and remission, for which the grantee dealt directly with the king's treasurer through a composition, accounted for the large amounts recorded under the 'allowances'. Secondly a general air of inefficiency seems to have surrounded the fiscal side of the sheriff's duties. In all the surviving accounts of the sheriffs, the arrears total was always prominent. In 1456, the rests at the end of the sheriffs' accounts amounted to £2,195-15-3 but by 1501 the scale had increased to £20,725-18-7. These totals, however, did not represent the overall total of arrears, as the present sheriff was not liable for the arrears of his predecessor. The crown made attempts to force the sheriff, along with other local fiscal officials, to clear their accounts.[199] Despite the crown's fulminations, many sheriffs' accounts continued to record large arrears, for in 1501, the sheriff of Roxburgh's arrears rose during the account from £1,096-4-6 to £3,968-1-7. On the other hand, during the account of the sheriff of Fife, of the same year, arrears of £993-17-8 were completely cleared.[200] A considerable proportion of the arrears total was of a temporary nature, namely casualties of judicial profits which had been charged to the accountant, and, although sold as a royal gift or remission, were not allowed to the sheriff in that particular account. The ward and relief of the lands of Spankgok, at £31-3-4, was charged to the sheriff of Renfrew in 1493, but James III had

---

198. Appendix No. B/6(d)

199. ADC, Vol xiv, f 177, 180.

200. Appendix No. B/6(d)

conceded the casualties to the late Robert, lord Lyle through royal letters which were recorded in the sheriff's account of 1492, but the sum was discharged to the sheriff only in 1501.[201] Nonetheless, a certain proportion of the arrears was of a permanent nature. It was for these arrears that various sheriffs were distrained as their collection was the personal responsibility of the sheriff. In 1501, the arrears of Duncan McIntosh, sheriff of Inverness stood at £2,276-3-8 and remained from his last account of 1494, for which his heirs and executors were to be summonned to pay the debt.[202] As far as the crown was concerned, the sheriff was held responsible for the sums charged to him in his account. However, the judicial records are full of cases pursued on the crown's behalf against various sheriffs for illegal activities, which acted to the detriment of the 'king's profit'. In 1505, William thane of Cawdor, sheriff of Nairn, was summoned for the delay in rendering his account, and for the illegal retention of £520 for the relief and ferms of the lands of Rait and Geddes, owed to the king as feudal casualty. The sheriff was ordered to appear before the Auditors on the 21 January next to make account but, in the meantime, he was to 'mak his lauchfull and possible diligence in execution of his said office'.[203] This entry highlighted two of the principal failures of the sheriff as a fiscal officer. Firstly, the 1501 accounts revealed plainly the lack of regularity in accounting on the part of the sheriffs. Out of a total of 30 accounts, only 13 were for a period of a year or less, and the accounts of the sheriffs of Banff and Inverness were for periods of 6 and 7 years respectively.[204] Secondly, there existed a

---

201. ER, xi, 373.

202. ER, xi, 315-6.

203. ADC, Vol. xvii, f 81.

204. Concerning the 30 sheriffs accounts rendered in 1501
6 accounts were for 1 term.
7 " " " 1 year
3 " " " 1½ years
4 " " " 2 years
4 " " " 3 years
3 " " " 4 years
And there were single accounts of 5, 6, and 7 years duration.

definite reluctance on the part of many of the sheriffs to pay fully what was owing to the crown without the threat of judicial proceedings. In 1497 the king took legal action against William, lord Ruthven, sheriff of Perth for the illegal detention of £200, and Hugh Campbell of Loudoun, sheriff of Ayr, for the withholding of £137-14-8, the rest of the issues of the justice ayre of Ayr, as both sums had been assigned to treasurer, Henry, abbot of Cambuskenneth for the king's expenses. I would appear that lord Ruthven possessed some sort of royal discharge although the king declared that he had never issued and had never intended to issue any such discharge, with the result both sheriffs were ordered to be distrained for the sums in question.[205] Although the sheriff was held responsible to the crown, it may have been that he was unable to collect the revenue from persons within his jurisdiction. In August 1501, Alexander Irvine of Drum, sheriff of Aberdeen, took legal action against various persons for the illegal withholding of the king's revenue. The defenders' failure to answer the summons, usually a fair guide to their guilt, relieved him of the burden of the debt.[206] In May 1503, John, earl of Crawford, as sheriff of

---

205. ADC, ii, 69-71. On 7 June, lord Ruthven pursued an action to secure the annullment of the decree against him in March. ADC, ii, 79. On the 1 April 1501 the action by lord Ruthven for the reduction of the decree of 1497 continued and although no decision was given, the distraining of lard Ruthven's lands was suspended. Unfortunately the action now disappears out of the judicial records, but the earnestness of Ruthven's legal retaliation against the 1497 decree suggested that there was probably considerable doubt about his failure to pay the Abbot of Cambuskenneth the £200.

206. ADC, (Stair Society), 93. The cash and persons involved in the action were;

£100	- Lord Forbes, principal coroner of the sheriffdom
£ 51-2-4	- John Lesley of Wardris, for ferms of Kintore
£ 4.	- Andrew Dun, for relief of lands of Ardenne
£ 10.	- Henry Douglas, Margaret Fenton, David Nairn, for relief of lands of Drumblait.
?	- James Stewart of Portirstoun, for relief of lands of Portirstoun.

Aberdeen, was reduced to taking legal action against his deputy, Alexander Bannerman of Watterton, in order to clear £880 from the rest of his account of 16 August 1502. Alexander Bannerman, as the sheriff's deputy, intromitted with feudal casualties and the issues of justice ayres to the tune of £880, and since he had obviously not accounted for any of the sum, was ordered by the court to be distrained for the cash and so 'to relieve the pursuer at the king's hands'.[207] The entering of an allowance in the account of the sheriff or indeed any other crown financial officer, did not necessarily presuppose actual payment. On the 11 July 1494, John, lord Carlyle took legal proceedings against the sheriff of Dumfries for the latter's illegal detention of £244, which had been allowed to the sheriff in his account by the Auditors of the Exchequer in 1486. The sum represented the non-entry and relief of the lands of sir David Heres of Terrigles within the bounds of the sheriffdom, which had belonged to lord Carlyle, and for which, the sheriff was to be distrained.[208] On the 25 October 1488, Adam Halkerstone complained to the lords of the Council, that, although William, lord Ruthven, sheriff of Perth, had received an allowance for the £30 to be paid to Adam through the mandate of the treasurer of James III, the sheriff had not in fact submitted the actual cash to Adam, which he was now ordered to do.[209] On the 31 January 1498-9, James Henrieson, the king's advocate complained that the sheriff of Stirling still retained the £27-13-4 which was to make up part of his pension, and the court ordained that the sheriff should reimburse Henrieson in two equal instalments, one within 15 days and the other before the eighth day after next Easter.[210]

Alexander Irvine of Drum, as sheriff of Aberdeen, managed to clear the backlog from his account of 1497 in an arrears account rendered in 1501.

---

207. ADC, Vol xiii, f 158.
208. ADC, i, 373.
209. ADC, i, 95.
210. ADC, ii, 324.

Allowances were given for the majority of outstanding sums, but two interesting items were recorded. Firstly there was a curious entry of £274-19-1, which was allowed to the sheriff as being overcharged through an error calculation. The history behind this error is unknown, but the size of the sum involved does little to enhance the sheriffs' reputation for efficiency. Secondly, the sheriff was unable to achieve an 'eque' in his arrears account, with the result he had to resort to compounding with the Treasurer, paying only £110 of the original £160. As shown above, although the sheriff received allowances for the casualties due from the lands of Kintore and Portarstown, the actual cash was still outstanding to the sheriff.[211] Although Alexander Irvine of Drum appears to have cleared himself of his responsibility as sheriff of Aberdeen, it was not without considerable loss to the crown.[212] The king was not averse to accepting a composition for irrecoverable arrears. In 1471 the sheriff of Ayr compounded for a rest of £266-10-1 through the payment of £100 to the Treasurer.[213]

In the field of administration, the sheriff was one of the principal vehicles in the collection of crown debts. Crown debtors were required to answer a judicial summons, pursued on the king's behalf, in which the merits of the case and the extent of the debt were considered. If the defender failed to answer the summons, or if he was declared guilty of the debt after the evidence had been considered, he was ordered by the court to reimburse the crown for the sums owing, or failing that have his lands and goods distrained. Within the realm of crown finance, debts might include failure on the part of merchants or crown tenants to pay the customs or rents, or the non payment of arrears of royal financial officers. In 1482-3 the auditors ordained the sheriff of Perth, 'to execute' the letters direct.to him of befor for the distrenzeing of Walter Stewart and mak penny of his movable gudis gif thair ony be within his schire, and failyeing

---

211. ER, xi, 336, 337 : ADC, (Stain Society), 93.
212. ER, xi, 334-7.
213. ER, viii, 22.

of his movable gudis that he mak penny of his unmovable gudis, efter the form of the act of Parliament, and this executioun to be done within xxti dais, the quhilk gif he dois nocht, the Lordis ordanis that letters be direct to schreffis in that part charging thame to distrenze the principalis schirefis landis and gudis for the some of iiii of merkis and mak this man be pait'.[214] On the 31 January 1496-7, John, lord Kennedy was accused before the lords of the Council of illegally withholding £80 of the farms of Arran which he should have paid to the comptroller after the tenor of his obligation at the last feast of St.Martin. The Lords ordered Kennedy to pay the comptroller the outstanding cash or suffer the poinding of his lands and goods for the debt.[215] In a charter issued under the great seal, dated 10 April 1496, it was stated that William, lord Graham was a royal debtor for the sum of £240 through his letters of obligation on behalf of Elizabeth, countess of Angus, for the ward of the lands of Balmouto which had been gifted to Elizabeth by the king. In order to recover the outstanding sum which had been assigned to the comptroller, sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch, to pay for part of the expenses of provisioning the king's household during the king's expedition to the Isles, from lord Graham, a letter was transmitted to the sheriff of Stirling stating that, since lord Graham had no distrainable moveable goods within that shire, the sheriff was to apprise 10 marks of the land of Sclatristok and 8 marks of the land of Scalfarquhare, which belonged to Graham, and deliver them into the hands of the crown. The lands were subsequently granted to Forrester who had probably compensated the king from his own pocket and to whom lord Graham would have to repay the debt in order to recover his property.[216] In 1455, the arrears of sir John Cockburn, a previous sheriff of Kinross, stood at £9-13-4 and in the account of the present sheriff, James Shaw, the latter was ordered to

---

214. ADC, ii, cxi.
215. ADC, ii, 63-4
216. RMS, ii, 2308.

distrain the lands and goods of sir John for the outstanding sum.[217] In a Parliamentary statute of 1503, it was recorded that the expenses of the sheriff, 'both ordinary and sheriffs in that part' for the execution of their office distraining persons for the recovery of debts was to amount to 12d for every pound to be poinded from the debtor.[218] On 4 November 1507 the sheriff of Stirling was instructed to apprise £10 of land belonging to William, lord Livingstone for a debt of 295 marks, certain fines incurred at the previous justice ayre at Stirling, with an additional £9-17/- for the fee of the sheriff.[219] Inevitably, this system suffered badly from administrative confusion and open abuse. On the 5 July 1494, sir Robert Crichton, sheriff of Dumfries, was ordered to restore 620 sheep and other goods to Thomas Kirkpatrick of Closeburn, which the latter had seemingly forfeited for the failure to pay certain unlaws at the ayre court of Dumfries. But, as the unlaws had been remitted to Thomas by the king, it was now the sheriff's turn to suffer distraint for the recovery of the sheep to Thomas.[220] Such an event reveals fully the lack of co-operation that existed between the centre and the king's officers in the locality. In this function, many sheriffs and their deputies, were involved in a mixture of genuine error and calculated fraud. John Murray of Mylntoun, sheriff depute, was found guilty of 'superexcressens of the gudes takin fra' Robert Bonar of Straithy and the former was to restore to the latter the difference, commuted to £21-10/-.[221] The tenants of Strabrock produced letters 'purchest be thaim in the first secund and thrid ferd formez apoun George lord Setoun schireff of Linlithgow' in an attempt to gain the restoration of their goods, which had been distrained for the unlaws of the

---

217. ER, vi, 112.
218. APS, ii, 250.
219. RMS, ii, 3150. For the debt, James Shaw compounded with the treasurer and received temporary occupation of the property until the debt was repaid in full.
220. ADC, i, 358.
221. ADC, i, 288.

sheriff's court. Despite this attempt, the decision favoured the sheriff who was declared to have acted legally and the letters were suspended.[222]

The evidence connectin the office of sheriff with the collection of taxation is scanty. Nevertheless, it appears that, in the fifteenth century, the sheriff did in fact supervise the assessment for, and the collection of, royal taxation. In 1437 the sheriff of Aberdeen was ordered to account for the issues ('antiqua financia') of the tax or contribution for the passage of the king's sister to France.[223] The preamble to the tax roll of the shire of Edinburgh, dated 26 March 1479, stated that John Haldane, the sheriff of Edinburgh, along with his council of William, lord Borthwick, sir William Knollis, sir John Sandilands, and sir James Lauderdale, chosen by the Edinburgh Parliament in March of that year, were to administer the tax levy for the shire.[224] The role of the sheriff is fully explained in the arrangements for the James I's ranson tax of 1424.[225]

During the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the sheriff became increasingly redundant as far as the financial affairs of the crown were concerned. The need for greater efficiency and the increasing employment of the composition, involving the treasurer rather than the sheriff tended to remove the sheriff from the financial scene. Also the crown probably realised that the sheriff would have been unable to cope with the increased amount of cash involved in the royal exploitation of

---

222. ADC, Vol., xii, f 176.
223. SRO, Lord Forbes Paper, 1. Appendix No. A/3(a)
224. Bannatyne Miscellany, iii, 427. 6 March 1478-9 the three estates granted to James III a tax of 20,000 marks for the intended marriage of the king's sister, Margaret and Anthony, earl Rivers, brother in law of Edward IV. APS, ii, 122.
225. APS, ii, 4-5. For further details see the conclusion.

the profits or justice and feudal casualties. Thus the practical effects of this alteration in the administration of royal finances could be seen in the 1501 accounts of the sheriff in which the majority of the entries were in fact 'fictitous' and the actual cash handled by the sheriff rose only slightly during the later Mediaeval period.

THE ACCOUNTS OF THE COMPTROLLER

The early development of the office of comptroller is obscured by the poor survival rate of the accounts of that officer. From its inception in 1425 until the accession of James IV in 1488, only two accounts of the comptroller have withstood the rigours of time and added together, they only spanned 19 months.[1] However, for the reign of James IV, a total of ten accounts have survived. Of these, seven were published in the printed volumes of the Exchequer Rolls, while the remaining three, deposited in Register House only in 1954, were published four years later in the Miscellany volume of the Scottish History Society.[2] The payment to the crown from the various local accountants, the 'Ballivi ad Extra', the custumars and the burgh baillies, made up the charge side of the accounts. The discharge comprised mostly of the expenses of the king's household, mainly supplies, pensions and other smaller miscellaneous items. Since the accounts of the comptroller only recorded the total cash involved in each section of the account, further information to the historian was obtainable only from outside sources; in the case of the charge, from the various accounts of local financial officers, as recorded in the Exchequer Rolls, and, in the case of the discharge, from the scanty remains of the 'liber emptorum' and the 'liber domicilii'.[3] Only in the section dealing with the payment of fees and allowances to household officers was there any attempt at the detailed analysis.[4]

---

1. September, 1449 to August 1450.
   April to June 1453
   May to October 1456. Account of Ninian Spot was not a comptroller's Account. See page 504.

2. Gouldesbrough, Introduction to the Accounts of Sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch, Comptroller, Misc. of Scot. Hist. Soc. ix, 59.

3. 'Liber Emptorum'; recorded the purchase of provisions and supplies for the kings's household.
   'Liver Domicilii'; recorded the daily entry of all provisions received for the household, either purchased, drawn from crown lands or obtained from the king's subjects through gift.

4. ER, x, 376-8, xi, 246-8, 255-9.

During the period of the comptroller's first receipts, between 1424 and 1425, the official was designated 'contrarotulator', but in subsequent accounts, the more familiar term 'compotorum rotulator' was employed.[5] An additional alteration of title occurred sometime in 1473-4 and 1482, in 1485 and again in the year 1511-12 when the officer was styled 'receiver general'. Although there was no obvious alteration in the revenue attached to the office, it is likely that the new designation gave the officer greater powers, of which more will be said later when financial position of the comptroller is considered.[6] Little is known about the amount of business actually performed by the comptroller but there can be little doubt he exercised greater personal control of the revenue assigned to him than the chamberlain. Although Albany and Buchan, as chamberlain, clearly did not personally receive revenue from local accountants, there is no doubt that the comptroller was engaged in the physical receipt of large portions of his income. However, the comptroller was assisted by various minor officials. The clerk of the rolls and register was responsible for keeping financial accounts and in 1505 Master Gavin Dunbar, the holder of that office, was permitted three servants according to the bill of the household. In the same document, the comptroller, James Redheuch, like the treasurer, was allowed the company of eight servants.[7] There is little doubt that the comptroller received the assistance of servants who received royal revenue in the name of the comptroller. However, there can be little doubt that the comptroller performed many of the functions of his office himself, the leasing of royal

---

5. ER, iv, 380-91, 401.

6. ER, viii, ix, xiii. Thomas Simpson accounted as comptroller on the 7 August 1473 and was styled 'receiver general' before 10 June 1474. Alexander Leslie of Wardris returned to the designation of comptroller by 29 August 1482. Alexander Lummisden styled 'receiver general' on 30 July 1485. ER, ix, 301. Andrew Bishop of Caithness entered the office of 'receiver general' on 12 March 1510-11.

7. SRO, Exchequer Household Paper and Accounts, E34/1.

property, the purchase of supplies for the king's household and the collection of revenue. Concerning the latter in 1499 sir Patrick Hume of Polworth was allowed an additional payment from his own accounts for his 'great labours' in the collection of farms in various part of the kingdom during the plague.[8]

In April 1424, James I returned to Scotland after eighteen years' captivity in England. James's entry into the Scottish scene had dramatic consequences, both politically and financially. It was the occasion of a major revolution in the administration of royal finances. In previous centuries, the office of chamberlain stood at the apex of the Scottish financial system and it was through that official that the crown had received the bulk of its income. During the reigns of Robert II and III and throughout the captivity of James I, the office of the chamberlain was under the control of Robert, earl of Fife and Menteith, Peter duke of Albany, either personally or through his son, John, earl of Buchan.[9] Under the aegis of Albany, royal income was frequently plundered by numerous members of the nobility, and although a prominent political figure and the chief financial officer of the crown, Albany appears to have been unable and indeed unwilling to rectify the situation. James's policy of greater royal control over the baronage and retrenchment in the realm of finance required not only the removal of the house of Albany, undoubtedly the leading baronial family in Scotland, but also the supplanting of the office of chamberlain, so associated with Albany's domination, with financial officials more amenable to the crown. The financial revolution was as effective as it was sudden. In 1424 or early in 1425 the offices of

---

8. ER, xi, 259.
9. Robert, duke of Albany, earl of Fife and Menteith, was appointed to the office of chamberlain by Robert II on the 16 November 1382 and continued in office until the 12 March 1406-7. On the latter date he granted the office to John, earl of Buchan, his eldest son by a second marriage, and the latter retained the office until his death in August 1424. Handbook of British Chronology, 179. ER, iv, 65.

treasurer and comptroller arose out of the vaccuum left by the dramatic diminution of the chamberlain's responsiblilities.[10] The latter office continued to function during the remainder of the fifteenth century but its financial powers were almost completely removed. Undoubtedly the desire to remove baronial affiliation with the crown's chief financial office was one of the principal motivations behind the fall of the chamberlain, but the rapid increase in the crown's fiscal invdvement under James I required the spreading of fiscal responsibility.

1425, the year of the first exchequer audit after the return of James I, was probably a transitional year. Although the actual receipt of crown income was spread among various receivers, David Brown, Comptroller, Walter Ogilvy, Treasurer, James Shaw, Steward of the Household, and John Livingstone, clerk of spices, the chamberlain, now sir John Forrester, appears to have retained ultimate responsibility for the accounts.[11] However, in subsequent accounts, the chamberlain made a rapid exit from the fiscal scene. During the reign of James I, the comptroller and treasurer emerged as the leading crown fiscal officers, but at first they shared responsibility for the collection of royal revenue with several other 'receivers'.[12] Between 1425 and 1435, the comptroller was the most consistant receiver of crown income, averaging around £1,100 annually and

---

10. On 8 Jamuary 1424-5 sir Walter Ogilvy of Luntrethan was acting as treasurer, while on 8 May 1425, David Brown, chancellor of Glasgow held the office of comptroller. Those are the first recorded references but both offices were probably established sometime in 1424.

11. Details of the receipts in the account 1424-5. Total receipts from the great customs and the burgh farms:

Chamberlaim	£ 184.-19-11
Comptroller	£ 817-7-9
Treasurer	£ 217-3-4
Clerk of Spices	£ 538-11-8
Steward of Household	£1,067-14-7

12. These payments to the crown were derived from the issues of the great customs and the burgh farms. They were the only accounts which have survived to demonstrate the fiscal arrantements under James I.

with total receipts for the period deuble those of his nearest rival, Thomas Mireton. In the years 1426 and 1434, the comptroller's receipts of £2,067-0-4 and £2,220-6-8 were far beyond those of any other 'receiver'. Although during the reign of James I, the comptroller was emerging as a prominent fiscal official, the policy of spreading responsibility for the gathering of royal revenue revealed that the reformed central financial organization was still in its infancy.[13] In 1426, the treasurer, (732-10-9) and the keeper of the privy seal (£389-7-7) were responsible for the collection of large portions of crown income. In the following years, four 'receivers' emerged in competition with the comptroller for the receipt of the king's revenue, Robert Gray as Master of the Mint, Nicholas Kirkdale and William Norville as clerk of the spices along with Master John Winchester and Master Thomas Mireton, both of whom do not appear to have acted under any official designation.[14] Total receipts associated with these four 'receivers' for the reign of James I amounted to £9,767-17-2 only £2,000 more than the £7,823-2/- accepted by the comptroller.[15] Also payment totalling £1,097-4-8 were received straight into the 'king's coffers' or the 'king's chamber', with no official being called to account

---

13. The rise of the office of Treasurer in the royal fiscal organization seems to have been slower. For details, see the chapter on the treasurer.

14. Master John Winchester, canon of Glasgow seems to have been involved in the financial affairs of the crown. He was auditor of the exchequer in 1428 and 1429 (ER, iv, 432, 465.) and in 1434 he examined the account books of the building of Linlithgow Palace (ER, iv, 555, 556.). In 1426 he acted as clerk to the keeper of the privy seal (ER, iv, 407.) From 1437 to 1460 John was bishop of Moray. Master Thomas Mireton, dean of Glasgow was also involved in fiscal affairs, for he acted as auditor in the same years as John Winchester. In 1431, he was auditor of the Exchequer and was styled treasurer, but in his receipts for the year 1430-1, no such designation was evident (ER, iv, 525).

15. Appendix B/8(a)

for the receipts. There is little information concerning the fate of these payments, but it is probable that they were used by the king for his own personal expenditure.[16] Even in the reign of James I, the comptroller seems to have been responsible for the provisioning of the king's household in the everyday essentials, but for the more luxurious items, namely drugs, fur, linen, cloth and expensive wine, for which the treasurer later assumed responsibility, James I contracted directly with his agents or the suppliers, who were refunded from the customars accounts and the ransom payments.[17]

Throughout the reign of James II and until the appointment of sir John Colquhoun of Luss as comptroller in 1464, the office of comptroller was still serving its apprenticeship. As in the reign of James I, other 'receivers' were employed by the crown to accept revenue from local accountants. From 1442 to 1444, the collection of crown receipts from the great customs, burgh farms and royal landed property was shared between Henry Livingstone, the comptroller, and Thomas Bully, steward of the king's household. On the 15 October 1456, Ninian Spot, canon of Dunkeld, rendered an account of his receipts from 1 May the same year until the date of the account.[19] Despite the description in the Exchequer Rolls, he did not act as comptroller, but in fact paid £517-17-1 to Alexander Napier, comptroller, for the expenses of the king's household, and his receipts from the local fiscal accountants made no mention of any office being attached to Spot.[20] His actual station is unclear, but it

---

16. Appendix B/8(a)
17. See chapter on the treasurer. ER, iv, 435-9, 470-5, 672-685. Payment to the suppliers may also have been made through the comptroller Treasurer and other 'receivers', but of this there is no evidence.
18. ER, v, 124-175. From the great customs Henry Livingstone received £1;150-2-11 for the years 1442-4, and Thomas Bully, £774-14-7 for the same period.
19. ER, vi, 289.
20. ER, vi, 291.

is probable that he acted as another royal 'receiver', making receipts from sources normally associated with the comptroller. Although later, from October 1456 to the spring of 1460, Spot was officially designated comptroller.[21] In the accounts for the year prior to 1460 and from 1460 to March 1460-1, part of the receipts from local accountants, usually paid to the comptroller, were instead received by Alexander Murray, as the 'king's 'receiver'.[22] The exact role of Alexander Murray is however obscure. In 1452 George Shoriswood accounted for payments received on behalf of the comptroller, Alexander Naim of Sandord, during the latter's absence in England.[23] Also in this period, there is evidence to suggest that there was still considerable confusion concerning the exact jurisdictional rights of the comptroller and the treasurer. In 1438, Walter Haliburton, the king's treasurer, accounted for receipts from sources namely from the great customs and the burgh farms, to the tune of £92-9/-.[24] Conversely, the 1450 account of comptroller, Alexander Napier revealed entries which later in the fifteenth century were recorded in the treasurers' accounts. Out of a total receipt of £5,405-8/- the returns from royal casualties and other compositions made with the king's council amounted to £841.[25] Some were of considerable value, for George, lord of Leslie submitted a composition payment of 200 marks for the ward of his lands inside the barony of Kincardine until the majority of the earl of Ross,[26] and £77-15/- was paid by various persosn as a composition payment for the remission of certain crimes.[27] On the discharge of

---

21. See Appendix A/1(B). Alexander Napier was in office sometime between 13 May and 15 September 1456, but was no longer in office on the 15 October. ER, vi, 113, 258, 291. He received a discharge from the king on the 24 October. Napier, John Napier of Merchiston, 25.
22. ER, vi, 580-647, vii, 1-45, 142, 153, 213.
23. ER, v, 604.
24. ER, v, 39.
25. ER, v, 391-6.
26. ER, v, 395.
27. ER, v, 394.

Alexander Napier of Merchiston from the office of comptroller on the 7 July 1461, remained vacant for the next three years. The reason for the vacancy is not recorded, but it is significant that it coincided with the splitting of the royal patrimony between the young James III and the queen mother, Mary of Guelders, based on the terms of her jointure.[28]

Responsibility for crown revenue was affected by the separation of the households of the king and the dowager, the profits from the latter's joint infeftment being received by Henry Kinghorm and John Darrach, her stewards, and also by Margaret Balfour.[29] The profits from the king's share of royal resources were received not by the comptroller, but by David Guthrie, his treasurer.[30] However, fhe final demarkation of the jurisdiction of the comptroller was probably achieved soon after the revival of the office in 1464. From 1464 until 1513 the responsibility of the comptroller seems to have been settled and regular payments were recorded from the issues of the great customs, burgh farms and the king's landed property into the comptroller's coffers. Payment to officials other than the comptroller from these sources tended to die out after 1464, although, in 1510, the receipts from the king's customers were divided between the comptroller and Master Thomas Dickson, who had beenappointed one of the Customers General of the realm.[31]

From the reign of James II onwards, there was a decided increase in the power exercised by the comptroller over the king's financial affairs. Under James I the clerk of spices accounted for his own receipts, but under his son reponsibility for these payments was transferred to the comptroller.[32]

---

28. ER, vii, 2, 4.
29. ER, vii, 47-224.
30. ER, vii, 107-224.
31. ER, xiii, 358-373. Receipts. Sir Duncan Forrester, Comptroller £ 856-10-5
Master Thomas Dickson, £1,847-0-3.
32. ER, iv, 437-535, v, 105, 299, 318. 340.

During the second quarter of the fifteenth century, the comptroller assumed complete control over the every day supplies of the royal household. Sir William Purves stressed the importance of the role of the comptroller by stating, 'He was esteemed in greater accompt than the Thesourer, he having the management of the whole proppertie, the placeing of all reseavers, challmerlaines, the uther of officers, the takeing of a cautione for thair fidelitie, the censureing and punishing them for abuses and disposeing them of thair offices, passing of all infeftments of the proppertie, and the managing of the haill affaires pertaining and belonging therto'.[33] From this statement and from contemporary sources, it is obvious that the comptroller held a dominant position in the management of the king's finances. The comptroller exercised considerable authority at the leasing of the royal demesne. He was a permanent member of commissions appointed for that purpose and, although the actual leasing could be condicted by only three of those named, it was consistantly stated that 'our said comptrollour beand ane of the thre'.[34] It appears that the comptroller was personally present at the leasing of all the crown's property. In 1457, the chancellor, William Murray of Tulibardine, and Ninian Spot, the comptroller, were reimbursed to the tune of £7-10-2 for their expenses at Perth, Methven and Loch Tay during the leasing of the king's estated in Strathearn, Methven, Glenlion and the neighbouring area.[35] As the representative of the crown, the comptroller probably acted under royal instructions and would have been instrumental in carrying our the king's will on any point connected with leasing. Although the presence of the comptroller was essential to the leasing of crown lands, his powers were by no means absolute. In 1485, Alexander Lummisden, comptroller, was recorded as having 'exceeded the bounds of his mandate' in letting the lands of Fife without the advice and consent of the other commissioners.

---

33. Purves, Revenue of the Scottish Crown, 22.

34. ER, ix, 603.

35. ER, vii, 366.

Since the king was unwilling to accept his action, Lummisden was compelled to refund the grassums that he had received from the various tenants concerned.[36] The comptroller played an important part in the leasing of crown lands, but the other members of the quorum present at the actual leasing were not present merely to rubber stamp the comptroller's arrangements. The above example revealed another facet of crown finance over which the comptroller exercised increasing power. The chamberlain of Fife, Thomas Simpson, was not charged with the grassum receipts from the earldom since they had been paid directly to the later Measter Alexander Lummisden, then comptroller, and when the administrative fault had been revealed, Lummisden's executors were compelled to refund the cash involved.[37] The circumvention of the local 'Ballivi ad Extra' in the payment of grassums appears to have originated in the reign of James III[38] and the practice was fairly widespread in the following reign. In March 1503, the fishing of the Spey was leased to Alexander Innes of that Ilk, for which he was required to submit a grassum levy of £80, not to the chamberlain of Moray, but straight to the comptroller, John Stirling, a payment which was recorded in the latter's own account.[39] By removing the middle man, payments from grassums and entries must have reached the royal coffers more rapidly and the comptrollers direct supervision of the payment ensured against evasion. As the comptroller exercised greater control over the finances of the crown's landed estate, so also were the great customs brought increasingly under his surveillance. The office of custumer general made its first appearance on the 2 February 1509-10,[40] and on 13 March 1510-11, the bishop of Caithness was granted a tack of all

---

36. ER, viii, 366.

37. ER, viii, 366.

38. ER, viii, 140, 219. See the chapter on crown leases and feus.

39. ER, xii, 180, 669.

40. ER, xiii, 366. See the chapter on Custumers' Account.

the burghs, towns and ports in Scotland, to endure for the length of his tenure in the office of comptroller. The powers granted under the tenor of the privy seal letter involved 'the power to excers and use the sammyn, deputis, clerkis of coketis, tronaris and all uther officiaris neidfull to create and mak under him, or to set the said custume as he thinkis mainst expedient for us in all or in part, assignand the said custumis to the sustentatioun of the household'.[41] In legal cases before the Council concerning the loss of crown revenue, the comptroller pursued the rights of the king. On 31 January 1496-7 the comptroller, Sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch opened legal proceedings against John, lord Kennedy for the withholding of £80 due to the crown from the farms of Arran.[42] Most items which affected the crown financially involved the comptroller. Concerning the complaint that 'we and our liegis ar gretly hurt and skaithit be regrating of wittalis in Leith and Edinburgh be divers personis inhabitaris tharof and utheris' the king issued a proclamation in 1507 stating that victuals should be sold 'commonly to all our liegis that likis to by, without ony regrating, and the price beis maid be our comptroller or zow (the provost and baillies of the burgh of Edinburgh) to the maist utilitie that may be done for our liegis'.[43] In several fields, the powers granted to the comptroller were augmented during the course of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

Unlike the chamberlain which continued in existance after 1424 as and aristocratic post with little financial responsibility, the office of

---

41. RSS, i, 2223.
42. ADC, ii, 68. Other judicial matters concerning the crown's fiscal policy usually involved the king's advocate.
43. RSS, i, 1568. The crime of regrating involved persons who 'byis all maner of wittall cumand to....baith fra strangearis and our leigis, and kepis tham to gret derth, regratand (or reselling) thame apon us and our leigis in augmentation of the gret derth of wittallis that now is and apperis to be amangis tham, incontrar our lawis and actis of parliament and the commone weil of our realme and leigis'.

comptroller was a professional appointment. With the extention of power and reponsibility, as mentioned above, and an increase in the amount of cash handled by the comptroller, especially during the reign of James IV, only men of considerable financial knowledge could hope to perform the duties with any degree of success. Thus men of high birth tended to shun the office of comptroller and most of the occupants were of professional background, with previous careers in either the church, court service or commerce. Several comptrollers came from mercantile stock, namely Alexander Napier,[44] William Cranstone and Thomas Tod [45]from Edinburgh with Duncan Forrester [46] and James Redheuch[47] from Stirling. Commercial life in the burghs was an ideal apprenticeship for service in royal financial administration. Some comptrollers originated from the lairdly class of landed society, men like sir John Colquhoum of Luss, James Shaw of Sauchie, Alexander Lesley of Wardris and Patrick Hume of Polworth.[48] Most of those holding the office of comptroller could boast of service to the crown before assuming office and most had previous experience in fiscal affairs. Thomas Simpson of Knokhill, first appointed comptroller in 1472, had been receiver of the farms of the earldom of Fife since 1464,[49] while Duncan Forrester, designated comptroller in 1492, received fiscal experience as custumar of Stirling and accounting for the accounts of the burgh farms of Stirling.[50] Prior to his appointment in 1505, James Redheuch had been actively engaged in royal fiscal affairs as custumar of Stirling,[51]

---

44. Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, as recorded in the list of provosts in office in 1403.
45. Ibid, Provost in the years 1488, 1491, 1498.
46. RMS, ii, 2325. Stated to be a burgess of Stirling.
47. RMS, ii, 2325. As above.
48. See list of comptrollers in the Appendix A/1b
49. ER, vii, 263, 326, 381, 453, 567, 652, viii, 91.
50. ER, ix, 66, 142, 224, 282, 341, x, 62, 132, 303.
    ix, 85, 159, x, 72, 149.
51. ER, viii, 248-622, ix, 66, 282, x, 62.

chamberlain of the earldoms of Strathearn[52] and Menteith,[53] steward of the household of Queen Margaret of Denmark,[54] and of James IV, both as prince[55] and as king.[56] Alexander Inglis, comptroller from 1488 to 1489, had, during the reign of James III a distinguished career in royal administation; he was frequently recorded as Clerk of the Register,[57] and auditor of the Exchequer,[58] and, during the latter part of the reign, was active in leasing crown lands.[59] It seems fairly certain that the financial and administrative demands of the office of comptroller and the risk of incurring a large financial deficit, repayment of which was frequently tardy and not alwasy complete, contributed to the unpopularity of the office. This situation is aptly demonstrated by the large overturn of occupants, where tenures of three or four years were regarded as long. Between the dismissal of Alexander Lesley of Wardris in August 1483 and the appointment of James Douglas of Pittendreich in July 1489, a total of seven years, no less than ten fresh appointments were required.[60] Within the year 1485, there were four alterations in personel, both Alexander Lummisden and David Luthirdale died or retired through ill health, with Alexander Leslie of Wardris and Adam Wallace of Craigie being dismissed or resigning after only five months and less than a month respectively.[61] As already mentioned, long terms of office were rare, but sir Duncan Forrester

---

52. ER, ix, 252-491, x, 41-318.
53. ER, 409, 492, x, 42-578, xi, 34-284, xii, 23, 142, 212.
54. ER, ix, 425, 451.
55. ER, ix, 483.
56. ER, x, 185, 429, 501, 580, xii, 27, 132, 144.
57. ER, viii, 266, 326, 401, 476, 559, 638,ix, 1, 43, 93.
58. ER, viii, 266, 326, 401, 476, 559, ix, 1, 92, 209,232, 437, 459.
59. ER, ix, 583, 603, 613, 642, 643, 648, 656.
60. See Appendix A/1(b)
61. Alexander Leslie of Wardris, 11 Sept. 1484 - 2 Feb. 1484-5. ER, ix, 593, 603.
    Alexander Lumsden, 28 March 1485 - died before the opening of the Exchequer. ER, ix, 301, 345, 586, 648.
    David Lutherdale, 17 Aug. to 20 Sept. 1485. David died soon after that date of dismissal, ER, ix, 435.
    Adam Wallace of Craigie, 12 Oct. to 7 Nov. 1485. ER, ix, 360, 451, 604.

of Skipinch retained the office of comptroller from 31 July 1492 until 10 November 1498,[62] while Alexander Leslie of Wardris' tenure lasted from 15 July 1475 to 2 August 1483.[63]

The comptrollers' charge was composed of sums received from the sheriffs, burgh baillies, custumars and 'Ballivi ad Extra', according to the 'responsiones' recorded in their individual accounts.[64] Although the totals are given or can easily be calculated, it is difficult to mark out any definte trends. In the first place too many of the accounts are missing, and secondly, even when their survival rate improved during the reign of James IV, they tended to be of variable durations, stretching from over a year to only a few months.[65] However, the regular receipts from the sheriffs, burgh baillies, custumars and 'Ballivi ad Extra' seem to have increased in value during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Taking accounts of a year's duration, i.e. 1449-50, 1496-7 and 1508-9, the income from these sources paid over to the comptroller rose from £3,189-19-4, 50 £6,047-3-6 and finally to £12,504-0-7.[66] Further details concering the increases in the individual accounts and the underlying reasons behind them have been analysed in the chapters dealing with the local officers responsible for their collection, yet there are some general observations. Firstly, during this period, there was a tendancy towards greater regularity in accounting by royal officials. Not only did this ease the comptroller's task considerably but it also tended to ensure a fuller return of revenue. Secondly, as the fifteenth century progressed,

---

62. Appendix A/1(b). RSS, i, 531.
63. Appendix A/1(b) ER, viii, 299, ix, 274.
64. At the end of the discription of a payment to the comptroller from the local account was inserted the phrase 'pro quibus respondebit' (for which the comptroller will answer). In the margin of the account was recorded the phrase 'respondebit Jacobus Redeheuch rotulator' - the name varying accorinding to who was comptroller at the time of payment. ER, xii, 459.
65. Appendix B/8(b)
66. Appendi.x B/8 (b)

the crown attempted to improve the efficiency and honesty of its local accountants and part of the increase in revenue which found its way to the comptroller was the result of this trend. The cash transferred by these local accountants to the comptroller represented the real revenue of the crown, namely the income expended by a central fiscal official, the comptroller, on the king and his court. In theory, the real revenue represented the surplus left after the deduction of various fees, pensions, local expenses, administrative costs and other items of discharge from the gross receipt charged to the local accountant. In practice, the real income was considerably smaller, affected by the existance of substantial arrears, inefficiency, corruption and land lying in wast or occupied illegally. From these four sources, the most dramatic increase occurred in the returns submitted by the 'Ballivi ad Extra'. In 1449-50 the comptroller's receipt from the crown's landed patrimony amounted to £2,345-6-7, but by 1495-6 its value had risen to £5,015-15-3, and finally in the last three complete accounts of the comptroller for the reign of James IV, namely 1502-3, 1507-8 and 1508-9, receipts of £6,519-8/-, £7,668-5-2 and £9,692-4-4 were recorded.[67] As far as the comptroller was concerned, receipts from crown estates represented by far the largest single item of revenue. The expansion of the royal demesne under James II and III and the drive for greater fiscal efficiency under James IV were reflected in the large receipts made by the comptroller from the 'Ballivi ad Extra'.[68] Between August 1497 and May 1498, the comptroller's account recorded receipts of £4,389-1-4 from the local 'Ballivi ad Extra', but eleven years later, in

---

67. See Appendix B/8(B). Although the first two examples were taken from accounts whose duration was stated to be 11 or 12 months, knowledge as to the exact duration of the accounts of 1502-3, 1507-8, 1508-9 is more uncertain as no definite dates are given, but the nature of the accounts suggested that they included roughly a year's receipts.

68. See chapter on The Acquisition and Exploitation of the Royal Demesne.

1508-9, the amount had doubled to £9,692-4-4.[69] James IV's burning desire for increased revenue encouraged him to exploit his landed property to a far greater degree than his predecessors had done. From the mid 1490's the crown was actively engaged in augmenting rents derived from the royal demesne, granting in return, leases of durations longer than the customary three or five years. During the last six or seven years of his reign, James IV, was active in the extensive letting of many royal estates in feuferm, bringing even greater financial rewards to the crown. Unfortunately the practical effect of feuing on the comptrollers' receipts cannot be assessed in the light of the comptroller's accounts, as no rolls have survived for the period between 1509 and the death of James IV. From the 'Ballivi ad Extra', the comptroller received payments of the four main types. Firstly, the most consistant and most extensive returns were derived from the annual payment of crown rents and later feufarms. The second source of revenue came from the grassum levies, payable at the outset or on the renewal of a lease and assessed in theory at one year's rent. Under normal circumstances, the local chamberlain or receiver submitted the returns from these two sources to the comptroller according to the 'responsiones', recorded in his account. However, the increasing tendancy of the comptroller to receive grassum levies direct from crown tenants was reflected in the accounts. In 1497, the comptroller, sir Duncan Forrester received £60 from Nigal Stewart as the grassum for the lands leased to him,[70] while in 1503, the grassums from certain lands in Galloway were submitted direct to John Stirling, comptroller, as contained

---

69. The 'Ballivi ad Extra' or local crown accountants responsible for the collection of rents and other dues from the landed estates of the crown were often styled 'chamberlains, receivers, or baillies' and if they accounted for a substantial block of land leased completely to them, were styled 'leasees'.

70. Miscellany of the Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 71.

in the 'king's rentals'.[71] In the later accounts of the comptroller, the destiny of certain receipts was stated in the charge. In 1497, 20 marks of the receipt from the farm of Kintore was to be assigned to Walter Leslie for his fee as Marischal of the household.[72] Thirdly, several receipts from the 'Ballivi ad Extra' were the result of the sale of goods belonging to the crown or of grain and livestock which formed the king portion of crown rents. In 1509, £43-18-2 was received by the comptroller from the chamberlain of Strathdon through the sale of the king's goods,[73] and in 1503, the comptroller confessed the receipt of £88 through the sale of 3 lasts, 8 barrels of salmon from Moray by the local chamberlain.[74] Finally, the settling of arrears was a not uncommon feature of the comptrollers' receipts from the 'Ballivi ad Extra'. Repayment of arrears could sometimes be a slow business. In 1502, Micheal Lindsay of Fairgarth rendered an arrears account on behalf of his father, James Linsay, in which part of the sums outstanding from James's last account of 1498 were settled, and in the comptroller's account of 1503, a further payment of £23 was recorded from the debt.[75] Frequently, the comptroller, in order to clear these accounting debts, settled for a reduced sum by means of a composition. In 1503 the comptroller, Joh Stirling, accepted a compostion for the arrears of Alexander, lord Hume from his accounts as chamberlain of the Forest of Ettrick and of the earldom of March, by which, in return for the clearing of lord Hume's debts of £731-19-2, 9 lbs. of pepper and 372 salmon, the comptroller settled for a lump payment of £454, of which £300 was rendered in cash and the remainder by obligation.[76] As witnessed in the above example, not all payments to the comptroller were rendered in hard cash.

---

71. ER, xii, 180, 650-656.
72. Miscellany of the Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 71.
73. ER, xiii, 252.
74. ER, xii, 179.
75. ER, xii, 62-4, 178.
76. ER, xii, 115-6, 119, 177.

Although such payments were recorded in the 'responsiones' of the account of the local 'Ballivi ad Extra' and as a result also appeared in the charge section of the comptroller's own account, it cannot be automatically assumed that the latter had actually received the sum in cash. In 1499, sir Duncan Forrester was charged with £66-13-4 from the farms of the earldom of Carrick, Leswalt and Menybridge for the Whitsun term 'through the obligation and promise of lord Kennedy'.[77] It would appear that John, lord Kennedy frequently employed the letter of obligation as a means of clearing his account and delaying the physical transfer of money until sufficient cash was available. In the 1495-6 account of comptroller, sir Duncan Forrester, the charge contained an entry of £80 received from lord Kennedy as a composition for the arrears of the farms of Arran, Carrick, Leswalt and Menybridge. The actual account of lord Kennedy stated that he had given the comptroller a letter of obligation for the sum concerned, by which payment was to be forth coming inside 20 days of the next feast of St.Martin, however, it would appear that, by the 31 January 1496-7, the cash had not yet been submitted as the comptroller had taken up judicial proceedings against lord Kennedy 'for the wrangus detencione and withhalding fra him of the soume of lxxx li aucht to him for the malis of Arane, that he suld haf payit to the sade schir Duncane efter the tenor of his obligacione at the last Mertymes terme, like as is at maire lenth contenit in the complaynt thareappoun'.[78] This example revealed that the comptroller's charge in common with many other financial accounts in Mediaeval Scotland, should not be taken at its face value as the sums contained in his charge merely listed the cash for which the comptroller was accountable and not what he had actually received into his hands. In the actual account of the comptroller, it is impossible to determine any real division between receipts paid in cash and those through obligation.

---

77. ER, xi, 245.

78. ER, x, 552-3, Miscellany of the Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 63, ADC, ii, 64.

As in the case of lord Hume, mentioned above, many local officials employed both means of clearing their accounts.[79] The majority of sums which appeared in the comptrollers' charge were recorded in the account rolls of the local 'Ballivi ad Extra', custumers, burgh baillies and sheriffs, which had been examined at the annual exchequer, but there were entries in the comptrollers' charge styled 'Extra Rotulos', or 'outside the rolls'. These receipts were derived from two main groups, firstly the grassums and entries which had been paid directly to the comptroller and so bypassing the accounts of the 'Ballivi ad Extra', and secondly items which had not appeared previously in the Exchequer Rolls of the years included in the comptroller's account. Concerning payments of the latter type, usually involving the 'Ballivi ad Extra', it was recorded that the comptroller's quittance for such cash recorded in his charge remained with the chamberlain, receiver or leasee as the sums involved had not reached the Exchequer and thus were outwith the property rolls.[80]

In the reign of James IV, it was usual for the comptroller to be charged with the cash value of the grain and livestock which had been 'sold' by the 'Ballivi ad Extra' within their own accounts. Although the kind provisions delivered to him for the royal household do not generally appear within the comptrollers' accounts until the reign of James V, during his father's reign there did occur occasional references to kind receipts. The fragmented account of sir Duncan Forrester, rendered on the 31 January 1498-9, both types of receipt were recorded. Many grain farms were in fact 'sold' within the accounts of the 'Ballivi ad Extra' but there were also several entries of barley from Fife and March,

---

79. ER, xii, 115-6.
80. ER, cii, 178-180. Concerning £106-12/- received from John Grant of Fruchie from the lands leased to him, the entry continued 'de qua summa quittantie rotulatoris remanent cum codem Johanne Graunt, quia non devenerunt ad scaccarium sed extra rotulus'.

oatmeal from Bothkennar, wheat from March and Stirlingshire, salmon from the river Spey and marts from Glendareul.[81] As well as the profits from the commutation of grain and livestock from royal property the comptroller also accounted for the cash resulting from the sale of hides, skins, fat and the intestines of animals, slaughtered for the royal household.[82] Their contribution averaged around £150 annually to the comptroller, but in 1509 the total from this source amounted to £741-18/-, although enlarged by an entry of £180 for the sale of 260 marts with hides received from McLeod of Lewis as part of his composition for the non entry of his lands of Lewis.[83] This type of revenue must have been extremely susceptible to the ravages of the weather and disease. In 1499, the hides and pelts stored at Peebles were said to have been destroyed by pestilence.[84]

Several other miscellaneous items appeared on the charge side of the comptrollers' accounts. The account of Ninian Spot of 1456 and two comptrollers' accounts of the reign of James II demonstrated a greater variety of items in their charges than did the later accounts of James IV's reign. Apart from the income derived from feudal casualties, justice ayres, remissions, and compositions for charters and letters, mentioned above and submissions from the treasurer and also loans, which will be mentioned in connection with the financial position of the comptroller, there were several other interesting receipts. In 1450, £100 was received from lord Somerville probably as repayment for a loan of £40 of Flemish coin which Alexander Napier, the comptroller, had advanced to his son in Bruges.[85] In 1452 Master George Shoriswood received £100 and £29-13-8 from sir Robert Crichton of Sanquhar and the lord of Lorne

---

81. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 76-9.
82. ER, xi, 245, 254-5, xii, 180, xiii, 118, 254, Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 65, 71.
83. See Appendix B/8 (b) ER, xiii, 253.
84. ER, xi, 254.
85. ER, v, 604.

respectively as repayment of their debts to the crown.[86] In the comptrollers' accounts of James IV's reign, such miscellaneous receipts were unusual. However, in 1499 the inhabitants of Leith paid the comptroller £100 in order to avoid their liability to serve in the royal army.[87] The purchase of military exemption by burgh communities was not uncommon, and the £150 and £225 submitted by the burghs of Perth and Dundee respectively to the treasurer in 1497 for the same purpose, represented one of few remaining vestiges of fiscal confusion between the comptroller and the treasurer.[88] Such concessions assumed different appearances, for, the letter of licence granted to Dundee 'to remane at hame fra the host at this tyme' was issued in return for a payment of 450 crowns 'gevin be thaim to the furthbringyng of the kingis artilyery', whereas, in 1496 a similar application from the burgh of Aberdeen was allowed and as payment, the burgh voted the king a 'propine'.[89] Included in the charge of the 1508 account of James Redheuch, was an entry for £373-13/- stated as the cash equivalent of teind returns from the 1507 crop of the parishes of Aberlady and Cramond.[90] No explanation is given for the origin of, or the reason behind, the levy, but the 'Rentale Dunkeldense' recorded that the tithes of the above parishes were assigned by the bishop of Dunkeld to certain merchants of Edinburgh, in order to finance the kings' projected pilgrimage of Jerusalem.[91] Such payments were granted by the bishop from the crops of 1507,1508, 1509, although the comptroller only accounted for the tithes for the year 1507.[92]

---

86. ER, v, 392-3.
87. ER, xi, 245. It probably referred to the raid on Norham in 1497.
88. TA, i, 313.
89. RSS, i, 112. Extracts from the Burgh Records of Aberdeen, 57. 'A propine' was originally a gift given in recompense of services and was in the form of drink money. Other 'propines' recorded in the Aberdeen burgh records suggested that it included quantities of wax, torches and spice as well as winde, which were periodically sent to the king, probably in return for some favour.
90. ER, xiii, 119.
91. Rentale Dunkeldense, 247.
92. IBID,247,250,253. However,thereis no record of a similar entry in the 1509 account of sir Duncan Forrester.

Since the king never embarked on his proposed pilgrimage, it can only be assumed that James IV merely pocketed the teind for his own use, as the cash gained from the sale of the 1507 crop was simply submerged in the general expenses of the comptroller. Finally, the 1509 account of James Redheuch contained two interesting receipts, the first was £40-4-3 paid to David Leirmonth, receiver of the see of St.Andrews, of which further submissions were recorded in the treasurers' receipts after the transfer of the See to Alexander Stewart,[93] and the second was a payment of £64 from James Sinclair, the result of his intromission with the goods of sir David Sinclair, who had failed to repay arrears which he had accumulated as chamberlain or Ross.[94] The latter entry proved that, although distraining the goods and lands of a royal chamberlain or receiver for his arrears was the final and drastic step, it could, none the less, be effective. Although the receipts from the sheriffs, custumars and burgh baillies revealed a substantial income in the reign of James IV from those of his grandfather, not much headway was made between 1488 and 1513. Any increases in revenue was due more to increased efficiency in accounting and cash collection than any concerted attempt to elevate the fiscal potential of these sources of revenue only from the custumars was any appreciable augmentation recorded, from £1,613 for the year ending December 1496 to £2,411 in 1509.[95]

The expenses of the royal household formed the principal feature of the comptroller's discharge. Information concerning the late Mediaeval

---

93. ER, xiii, 247, TA, iii, 29-30, 243, iv, 11-12. On the death of James, Duke of Ross and archbishop of St.Andrews in 1540, James IV, appointed his illegitimate son, Alexander to the See and since he was as yet a minor, the king legally appropriated the revenues of the Archbishopric. See chaper on Treasurers Accounts.

94. ER, xiii, 247. ER, xii, 514, xiii, 43, 142, 345, 540, 510. The arrears of sir David Sinclair continued to be mentioned in the accounts right up until 1513.

95. See Appendis B/8(b)

Scottish household is exceptionally scanty and is derived before 1508 only from isolated reference in Exchequer and Treasury sources. However, it is obvious that the comptroller was responsible for the financial arrangements concerning the provisioning of the household.[96] In this function, the comptroller received the assistance of the steward of the household. The latter's role, as established in the household of James V, was stated to be of 'speciall support and helpar within the houss of my lord Comptrollar and reddy to answer unto the maister of houshald in all poyntis concernyng the fourneissing and provisioun broucht within the houss, and to se the perfite ordouring and distributioun thairof to the contentment of thame to quhom it aportenis, and to sit at the comptris daylie with the rest of the auditouris thairof and gif his oppinioun and mak answer in six thingis as sall happin to be disputable at the saidis comptis'.[97] Originally under the control of the chamberlain in the fourteenth century,[98] the office of Steward appears to have asserted a certain degree of financial independance during the early years of the comptroller,[99] but by the middle of the reign of James II, the comptroller had gained control of the steward's financial affairs.[100]

---

96. The Master of the household was concerned with most of the other, non-financial affairs of the household (i.e. discipline). SRO, Household Papers, No.6. (Instructions by James V to the Master of the Household.)
97. SRO, Household Papers, No.7.
98. Bateson, 'The Scottish King's Household', Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, ii, 39.
99. ER, iv, 380-90, v, 124-175, 187, 190, 192, 195, 202, 204, 213, 485. The office of steward received considerable portions of royal revenue between 1442-4 under Thomas Bully.
100. ER, v, 504. Robert Nairn, steward, received his revenue through the office of the comptroller, then occupied by Alexander Nairn, and this situation became the norm for the remainder of the later mediaeval period.

Basically, as it had developed by the reign of James IV, the comptroller's household expenses were divided into five main groups. The first concerned the cost of the daily supply of provisions for the royal household as detailed in the 'Liber Emptorum' and the 'Liver Domicilii'. Purchases were made daily by the steward, flesher and several other persons who then submitted regular bills, entered in the 'Liber Emptorum'. This book contained the totals of the purchases for each day, month and year or the period covered by the account of the comptroller. The surviving 'Liver Emptorum' for the reign of James IV, dated from 1 September 1511 to 6 August 1512, gave a fair insight into the nature and extent of the purchase of daily provisions. From the 1 October 1511 to the 6 August 1512 a total of £5,906-17-10 was spent on the provisioning of the household, with the average monthly bill around £500, except for December, when a bill of £1,334 was recorded. The exceptionally large figure for the month of December was the result of a spate of purchases in connection with the festive season, for on the 8th a total of £700-19-5 was spent and on the day before Christmas £106-18-3 was used for the purchase of provisions for the Christmas feast. The average daily cost of provisioning the royal household ranged from £5 to £25, but periodically the daily total was greatly inflated by the purchase of large quantities of grain and meat. On the 8 December 1511, 597 marts with hides from MacLeod, owed through an obligation, were purchased by Andrew, bishop of Caithness at 10/- each[101] and a further 180 marts were purchased in Sutherland on the same day, making an overall expense of £458-10/-. On the 18 December, 61 marts with hides

---

101. In the calculation of totals of foodstuffs, the long hundred was employed (i.e. 120), this the total of 597 marts from MacLeod was calculated in the following manner,

iv^{C} equals 480.

v^{XX} represented five times 20, namely the short hundred.

xvii the normal seventeen

Thus iv^{C}v^{XX} xvii represented the figure 597.

Decreed of 4 July 1511 that Malcolm MacLeod of Lewis was to pay the king 1,786 marts in quarters for his composition for the non entry of his lands of Lewis etc. through an obligation to be delivered good and sufficient at the Haven of Stornaway within 20 days of each term or on the arrival of the ships thereafter. ADC. xxiii, f10.

were bought at the Perth fair by James Robertson at a cost of £78-3-8. On the 11 April 1512, sixty pigs were purchased at Glasgow for £23, while on the 29th of the same month, 5 chalders of corn were bought from Alexander Lawder and a further 2 chalders from George Halkerstone at a combined cost of £75. On the occasion of the temporary separation of the king and queen, the accounts of the latter's household were rendered under a separate heading. Thus, between 20 June and 21 July, excluding the 13 July when the queen dined at the expense of the earl of Arran, a total of £199-15-5 was expended on the provisioning of her household. Whereas the amount and cost of supplies to the king and his household tended to be listed daily, those of the queen and her household tended to be calculated for a prescribed period. The latter was organized under four headings, the pantry for the supply of bread, the cellar for wine, the buttery for ale and beer and the kitchen for the remaining supplies including meat, fish, poultry, coal and butter.[102] In order to gain some insight into the consumption of mediaeval households, from 30 September to 9 October 1511 the following items were provided for the queen and her household at Stirling, 590 loaves of bread, 33 gallons of ale, 4 salted marts, 1 barrel of salmon from Ross, 140 dried cod, 75 mutton carcasses, purchased for £10, over 13 stone of butter and £30-8/- was expended on the provision of capons, poultry, coal and other small expenses.[103]

The 'liber Domicilii' or Liber Dietarum' (to give the book its alternative title) also rendered a daily account of the provisions received into the household, although in great detail that tne 'liver Emptorum' and it must have provided a useful corss check for the accountants.[104] It

---

102. SRO, 'Liber Emptorum' E32/1. There wer references to the books in the rèign of James II, ER, v, 602.
103. SRO, 'Liber Emptorum' E32/1
104. SRO, 'Liber Domicilii', E31/1. For the reign of James IV, the only surviving account was dated from 16 August 1512 to 16 November the same year. There were references to the books in the reign of James I. ER, iv, 467.

recorded not only a list of provisions purchases for the royal household but also the supplies which had been collected from crown lands or which had been received as gifts.[105] In the account for Christimas day 1528, a detailed picture is given of the extent and cost of the demands of the royal household, for £151 was spent on the purchase of supplies. The consumption of the household included 620 loaves, 142 gallons of ale, 8¼ marts and 6 carcasses of grass marts, 53½ sheep, ox tongues, one boar's head, a variety of poultry which included capons, geese, sea fowl, partridges, woodcocks, moorfowl, ducks and swan and miscellaneous items including milk, cheese, butter, eggs, apples and pears.[106] Secondly, there was a section concerned with the purchase of coal, fuel, candles, the cost of carriage and other small expenses, under the general heading of 'uncosts'. Details of these 'uncosts' appeared in a separate, undated section of the 'Liber Emptorum'.[107] The remaining three sections dealt with the purchase of spices and chandlery (cloths, towels and cups), the supply of various types of wines and finally the provisioning of oats and hay for the horses of the king and the officers of his household. The various sections of the household books recorded not only the amount of supplies purchased but also provisions derived from the king's own property. In the comptroller's discharge under the sections concerned with the general supplying of the household and the royal stables, it was stated that the expenses involved dealt only with purchases and no account was taken of supplies received from crown lands,[108] or from the king's own goods. Supplies of wheat, oats and barley were regularly transported to the royal household from crown lands in Fife, Stirlingshire, Menteith and Moray, while the latter earldom also provided an annual flow of salmon.[109]

---

105. National MSS. of Scotland, iii, No.17.
106. Ibid.
107. SRO, 'Liber Emptorum', E32/1
108. ER, x, 375-6, xiii, 181, 254.
109. ER, xiii, 5-9, 12-14, 26-28, 60-1.

The cost of sustaining the royal household was the largest single item on the comptroller's discharge. The account of Alexander Napier between September 1449 and August 1450 revealed a total expense of £5,590-18/- with £4361-14-10 for provisions, including wine, £353-16-1 for spices and chandlery, £840-7-1 for uncosts, and finally an additional payment of £35 was made over to the king's bakers.[110] Between April and June 1452, Master George Shoriswood, acting on behalf of Alexander Nairn of Sandford, recorded household expenses totalling £860-10-2 for the two months of his account.[111] Because of the lack of any surviving comptroller's accounts for the reign of James III it is impossible to make any assessment of the cost of household expenses during that period. The only hint as to the extent of household expenses during the reign of James III comes from comparing the cost of provisioning in the reign of James II and in the early years of James IV. The figures, in fact, suggest that, allowing for annual fluctuations, there was little change in the amount of cash spent on provisioning the king's household during the second half of the fifteenth century. In 1449-50 the total cost amounted to £5,590-18/-, while, for the 9 months between November 1491 and August 1492, household expenses totalled £4,485-16-10 and for the year 1495-6, a figure of £6,288-19-2 was recorded in the household books. Unlike the household accounts of James II's reign, those for the year from December 1495 to the same month twelve months later, recorded not only the total expenses for daily provisions (£3,522-10-11), spices and chandlery (956-12-5) and 'uncosts' (810-3/-), but included separate entries for the purchase of wine (559-4-6), previously included in the total cost for provisions and the expense of the royal stables (£239-3-8). The total expense for 1495-6 amounted to £6,288-19-2. Although the comptroller's expenditure on the royal stables was first included in the

---

110. ER, v, 396-7.

111. ER, v, 606-8.

account for 1492, there was no previous mention of the books of avery in the Exchequer Rolls.[112] The total expenditure during the comptrolller's account of 1495-6 was increased to a final total of £7,103-5-2 by expenses 'outside the household' or 'extra domicilium' of £629-3-6 for provisioning the army of invasion at various places on its way to England, and £185-2-6, for expenses 'in the avery'.[113] The daily household books referred only to the main body of the hoysehold and when the king travelled with a small retinue, leaving the mass of the household behind, entries were made in books 'ad Extra'. Similar entries were made for the provisioning of the royal army or navy, which were recorded under separate headings in the comptroller's discharge.[114] In the following account of sir Duncan Forrester, dated from December 1496 to July 1497, expenses of £490-0-3, 8 chalders, 5 bolls of wheat, 9 chalders, 10 bolls of malt and 240 loavers of the king's bread, were allowed to the comptroller for the king's expenses with his army on the marches, at Horham and at Heyton in England from the 21 June to 9 August 1497, as detailed in the books 'ad extra'.[115] In the 11 months account of September 1502 to August 1503, the total cost of provisioning the royal household at £5,287-0-3 still revealing little overall increase. However a further £6,125-4-6 was spent by the comptroller on household expenses during the period of the king's marriage celebrations, from 7 August to 6 September 1503.

---

112. ER, x, 375-6. Miscellany of the Scot.Hist. Soc., ix, 65. ER, x, 411. The first mention of avery books occurred in the 1493-4 'Ballivi ad Extra' account of Tealing.

113. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 65.

114. ER, x, 486, 514.

115. Miscellany of Scot. Hist., Soc., ix, 72.

116. ER, xii, 181-2. The household expenditure during the marriage of James IV to Margaret Tudor.

	£ 2,043-8-1	Provisioning.
	£ 1,142-10-6	Spices and chandlery.
	£ 2,278- 2-0	Wine.
	£ 373- 2-10	Stables.
	£ 334-10-5	'Uncosts'.
	£ 953-10-2	The outlay at Lamberton church, the town and monest ry of Haddington, Dalkeith, Newbottle and the Dominican Monest ry in Edinburgh, with banquets to the Queen and to Scottish and English commissioners in the inns and taverns of Edinburgh.
TOTAL	£ 7,125-4-6	

By Scottish standards, the outlay for supplies for the marriage of James IV was excessive, for the total cost for the month of celebrations exceeded the household expenses for the entire year. However towards the end of the reign of James IV, household expenditure had increased dramatically. The comptrollers' accounts for 1507-8 and 1508-9 recorded total household expenditur of £12,551-19-1 and £11,583-3-4 respectively.[117] The final account of the reign, dated 1510, recorded payments of £7,203-14-6 for everyday provisions, £1,565-5-6 for 'spyce, walx and napre' £1,186-18/- for 'uncosts' £954-8-2 for winde expenses, and £1,072-11-5 for the stables, with an overall total of £11,982-17-7.[118] The trend in household expenditure appears fairly clear; during the second half of the fifteenth centruy until sometime between 1503 and 1507, the cost of provisioning the king's household remained relatively static, but during the final five or six years of the reign of James IV, expenses doubled. A monthly division of household expenditure revealed a similar upward movement in spending. In the twelve months between September 1449 and August 1450 the average monthly bill amounted to £466, between December 1495 and the same month 1496 the total had risen to £524, between September 1502 and August 1503 (excluding the month which coincided with the king's wedding in which there was a vastly inflated expenditure), the total was £529, but during the eleven months following September 1508, the average monthly expenditure total had doubled to £1,053. It is extremely doubtful if there was any perceptable price rise during the first decade of the sixteenth century in Scotland and this dramatic rise in household spending

---

117. ER, xiii, 118-9, 124, 254-5. These two accounts were roughly of eleven to twelve months duration. Both included separate entries for the queen's household.

1507-8	£1,099- 5/-	to sir Duncan Forrester as the Queen's Purveyor
1508-9	£ 273-16-10	The Queen's household expenses from 5 August to 5 September 1508.

118. SRO, Household Papers, No.3

was almonst entirely due to increased consumption, resulting from a startling increase in the scope of the royal household during the latter years of James IV's reign. A similar trend was obvious under James V, for, towards the end of the reign, the costs were recorded as treble the pre 1503 level, reaching a total of £19, 229 between September 1539 and the same month 1540.[119] It is significant that this increase in household expenditure during the final years of James IV was reflected in all the sections of the household books in a fairly even proportion, so that no single item was augmented at a greater rate than the others.[120]

It is interesting to compare the cost of the daily provisioning of the Scottish royal household with that of the English. In England during the same period, the 'cost of diets' (which revealed the daily cost of food and other provisions), demonstrated, that under Edward IV, household expenditure increased from about £9,000 in 1463-4 to between £11,000 and £12,000 annually in 1476-8.[121] However, Edward IV's household expenses appear to have been moderate compared with his predecessors and successors. Under Henry VI, gross expenditure on the household was never less than £13,000 and usually in excess of £15,000 while during the reign of Henry VII total expenditure was normally around £14,000.[122] Thus for the majority of the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the cost of supplying the English household was at least double that of the Scots, but during the last few years before Flodden, the gap narrowed. Besides the king, other members of the royal family possessed their own households with their own personal stewards, yet evidence concerning these households is extremely meagre. The Exchequer Rolls recorded that the future James III had his own household after 1452 under John Anderson and sir John Lothian.[123]

---

119. ER, xvii, 276-7.
120. See Appendix B/8 (c)
121. Myers, The Household of Edward IV, 39.
122. Ibid, 46, 229-30.
123. ER, v, 493, 551, 590, 619., vi, 3, 280.

In 1456, William Murray of Gask received £120 from the farms of the earldoms of Menteith and Strathearn for the expenses of the prince sustained by him for the last three terms, and £66-13-4 for the expenses of David, earl of Moray, another son of James II, for two term's expenses.[124] The future James IV received quantities of grain into his own household from 1474 onwards.[125]

Evidence concerning the existance of queen's household books is more plentiful. There is no evidence that Mary of Guelders retained a separate household during the lifetime of James II.[126] However, after the death of James II in 1460, the households of the new king, James III, and Mary were separated, sometime between March 1460-1 and July 1462, when it was settled by the royal council or Parliament that 'the king suld ay remane with the quene, but scho suld nocht intromit with his profittis, but allenarlie with his person'.[127] From 1461 until the queen's death near the end of 1463, the 'Ballivi ad Extra' of the king's and queen's lands audited separately. The splitting of the royal household required the existence of two stewards to serve each, thus William Blair, formerly responsible for both households until the division, continued to administer that of the king, while sir Henry Kinghorn controlled the queen's.[128] Sir Henry Kinghorn received the fruits of the queen's joint infeftment and the sale of the queen's hides and pelts, and in his sole surviving account for the period from the 3 August 1462 to the 24 September 1463, his receipts amounted to £1,663-0-7. However, that figure proved to be slightly misleading as £831-17-4 had been paid to him from the queen's coffers by Margaret Balfour, who seems to have

---

124. ER, v, 280.
125. ER, viii, 293, 295, 447, 448, 500, ix, 55.
126. Only 'books of expenses' were mentioned, ER, vi, 5.
127.
128. ER, vi, 62, 76, 108, 117, 120-1

assumed the role of the queen's treasurer and accepted payments bound for her coffers.[129] Margaret of Denmark, the wife of James III, retained a separate household from sometime before October 1483 until her death. Under successive stewards, Robert Colville, Robert Wallace and James Redheuch cash and kind supplies were received from crown lands and the great customs into the queen's household. £246-3-2 was spent from the 1485 account of the custumers of Edinburgh on spices and wine which were delivered to Robert Colville for the queen's household.[130] During a transaction between Queen Margaret and George, earl of Huntly, the leasee of Arcmeanach, the latter was required to send 'fyffty gud martis now until haste til oure lardner in Striueling'.[131] Margaret Tudor appears to have had a separate household only for a short time during the reign of James IV, namely from 25 January 1507-8 to 5 September 1508. The account of sir Duncan Forrester, styled as the queen's purveyor from January until the 4 August 1508, was heavily reliant on the king's comptroller and treasurer. Apart from £27-5/- derived from the sale of the queen's hides and the intestines and fat of her marts, Forrester's charge was composed of £1,533-8/- received from James, Abbot of Dunfermline, treasurer and £1,099-5/- from the comptroller James Redheuch. Since the household expenses amounted to £3,347-0-10 (excluding the entries in the gooks of the king's own supplies) it was left to the treasurer to absorb the 'superexpense' of £692-2-10, and leaving all the fees and pensions for the officers and servants of the queen's household to be met by the comptroller.[132] Sir Duncan Forrester continued

---

129. ER, vi, 227-8. (The account of sir Henry Kinghorn had no surviving discharge). ER, vi, 59, 66, 81, 86-7.

130. ER, ix, 345.

131. Innes, Rose of Kilravock, 148-9.

132. ER, xiii, 125-7. The cost of provisioning the queen's household for the seven months

£2,224-3-5	Provisioning
£ 357-3-1	Spices and Chandlery
£ 416-0-11	Wine
£ 74-1-11	Stables
£ 275-11-6	'Uncosts'

to account separately for the queen's household until 5 September 1508, when the two household were again merged into one under the comptroller.[133] Before and after this divergance, the queen's household expenses were included in those of the king's.[134] Since the queen's purveyor had received his revenue from the king's officials and not from the queen's jointure lands, his existence seemed superfluous.

Those persons entitled to be in residence in the king's household were registered in the 'bill of household'. The need for a concise list of those permitted to be present in the household was obvious on the issuing of the statement that 'the haill place and residens of the king quhatever it be clengit of all maner of rascall and boyis and will and unhonest personis quhatsumever'.[135] Such a list was drawn up on the 5 January 1507-8. Hangers on and other unauthorised persons, who would have consumed the food assigned to those present at court, undoubtedly existed and these lists made some attempt to track down these undesirable and costly persons. The most important personages were allowed a certain amount of servants within the king's household, namely eight each for the archbishops of St.Andrews and Glasgow, the earl of Angus as master of the household, the treasurer and the comptroller, six for the bishop of Aberdeen as the keeper of the privy seal, four each for other bishops, lord Avondale as master Usher, the earls, lord Hume as chamberlain and lord Gray as the king's justiciar. Other officers and men of influence were permitted one, two or three servants in the household according to their position. Also the following arrangement was in operation, that 'ilk lord extra ordinar out of the bill of houshald to enter with ii personis with hym and to the nemmyt quhat he was at the nixt compt be name be the mercheall', while knights and 'every honest gentilman of reputacion' was permitted to enter the household with only one servant. The other residents within the

---

133. ER, xiii, 254-5.

134. ER, xii, 446, xiii, 288-9.

135. SRO, Household Papers, E34/1.

to account separately for the queen's household until 5 September 1508, when the two household were again merged into one under the comptroller.[133] Before and after this divergance, the queen's household expenses were included in those of the king's.[134] Since the queen's purveyor had received his revenue from the king's officials and not from the queen's jointure lands, his existence seemed superfluous.

Those persons entitled to be in residence in the king's household were registered in the 'bill of household'. The need for a concise list of those permitted to be present in the household was obvious on the issuing of the statement that 'the haill place and residens of the king quhatever it be clengit of all maner of rascall and boyis and will and unhonest personis quhatsumever'.[135] Such a list was drawn up on the 5 January 1507-8. Hangers on and other unauthorised persons, who would have consumed the food assigned to those present at court, undoubtedly existed and these lists made some attempt to track down these undesirable and costly persons. The most important personages were allowed a certain amount of servants within the king's household, namely eight each for the archbishops of St.Andrews and Glasgow, the earl of Angus as master of the household, the treasurer and the comptroller, six for the bishop of Aberdeen as the keeper of the privy seal, four each for other bishops, lord Avondale as master Usher, the earls, lord Hume as chamberlain and lord Gray as the king's justiciar. Other officers and men of influence were permitted one, two or three servants in the household according to their position. Also the following arrangement was in operation, that 'ilk lord extra ordinar out of the bill of houshald to enter with ii personis with hym and to the nemmyt quhat he was at the nixt compt be name be the mercheall', while knights and 'every honest gentilman of reputacion' was permitted to enter the household with only one servant. The other residents within the

---

133. ER, xiii, 254-5.

134. ER, xii, 446, xiii, 288-9.

135. SRO, Household Papers, E34/1.

household such as chaplains of the closet, doctors, henchmen, pages and grooms of the chamber, chaplains in the king's chapel royal, bakers, trumpeters, heralds, falconers or knights of attendance and squires of the household.[136] Despite the attempt to remove 'hangers on' at court, those permitted to be present according the the 'bill of household' amounted at lease to 270 persons with over 280 servants.[137] Although not all of these individuals would have been in the king's presence at one time, nonetheless the rapidly expanding body of courtiers must have put a severe strain on the bill for royal catering.

A further permanent item on the comptroller's discharge was dervied from the regular payment of the fees or pensions and horse fodder to officers and servants within the royal household. These fees were mostly paid annually by the comptroller. However, included in each monthly total, of the 'Liber Emptroum' were the wages of Elizabeth Maxton, laundress to the queen, who was paid at the rate of 8d a day or 20/8 a month, and fourteen minstrels, who received £24-10/- a month.[138] Their contribution to the discharge section of the comptroller's accounts increased during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. From a mere £84-7-10 in 1449-50, the annual fees and 'horsmete' total rose to £542-5/- in 1491-2. Until 1500 the total remained relatively static, but in 1502-3, payment of fees and horse fodder rose to £710-8-4. However the last three accounts for the reign of James IV revealed a dramatic increase to £1,056-10/- in 1508, £996-1-8 in 1509 and £959-11-8 in 1510.[139]

---

136. SRO, Household Papers, E34/1

137. SRO, Household Papers, E34/1

138. SRO, 'Liber Emptorum', E32/1

139. See Appendix B/8 (d)

A few interesting observations can be drawn from the extent and the nature of these entries. Firstly, the fees paid by the comptroller were almost totally to those connected with the royal household or the exchequer. Those fees which were payable out of the king's property were delivered through the comptroller. In 1503, the 20 mark fee owed to sir Patrick Crichton, the royal painter was paid from the farms of Ettrick Forest, but through the auspices of the comptroller.[140] Despite the enactment of 3 February, designed to endure until the king's majority, revoking all gifts, infeftments and assignations made since the coronation 'and quhare thare is ony feis or dewteis to be gevin to officiaris, wardanis and utheris, sic lik that haif feis in his faderis and grantschiris tymes that the samyn feis be payit to thaim be the handis of his Ressavouris and comptrollouris and that thai tak na dewiteis of the kingis propir landis for na assignacioun maid to thaim,'[141] until the reign of James V the intention appears to have reamined a dead letter. The purpose was to ensure that the fees of all royal employees should be submitted directly through the comptroller and not from local sources and although this trend was well underway during the reign of James IV, the comptrollers' funds were not as yet sufficient to absorb such an increase in expenditure.

The comptroller's accounts provided considerable insight into both the personnel and the financing of members of the royal household. The comptroller's discharge revealed an elaborate hierarchy of fees and pensions. Payments associated with each office tended to vary to some extent, for in 1492, Adam Hepburn received a fee of £20 for his post as master of the royal stables, but in 1496, his levy had been reduced to 20 marks for the same office.[142] Concerning the office of butler, in

---

140. ER, xii, 114, 182. After the entry in the account of the 'Ballivi ad Extra' the comptroller was declared to be answerable in his account for the payment.

141. APS, ii, 219. ADC, i, 168-9.

142. ER, x, 376. Miscellany of Scot.Hist. Soc., ix, 66.

1492 the office was held by sir Patrick Hume of Fastcastle, and in 1496, 1497 and 1499 by Archibald Edmonstone of Duntreath, at a fee of 20 marks, but from 1503 until the end of the reign the fee for the office was reduced to £10 annually.[143] Movement the other way was also possible, for in 1492 Alexander Stevenson was paid a fee of 4 marks as keeper of the napery, whereas, in 1496, in charge of the same office, Alexander now received an annual payment of £4.[144] Taking the 1508-9 account as an example; the highest fee was paid to James Edmonstone, who received £20 annually for the office of keeper of the silver vessels, thirteen persons including the principal usher of the king's chamber, the two ushers of the outside chamber, Patrick Crichton, pantler, Peter Crichton, master of the king's wardrobe, the master of Gray as the king's carver, and seven marshals, received annual fees of 20 marks, twelve persons, including two stewards, the clerk of the rolls, the barber, the doorkeeper the flesher, the furrier and the tailor were paid £10 each year, John Balfour, keeper of the stone vessels received 10 marks annually and a total of eighteen persons from various sections of the household were given fees of 6 marks annually. The scale of fees fell progressively as the offices diminished in responsibility and prestige. At the lowest point of the scale, Malcolm, the groom of the hall, and John Thompson, Kerswell Patrick Cuke and Butoun in the kitchens each received an annual fee of 2 marks, while five 'turnbrochis' or trunspits were given one mark each for the provision of their winder clothing.[145] Also, within the comptroller's discharge, although outside the section dealing with the above offices, other royal servants received annual pensions: for example John Auchinlek and Maurice Buchanan, esquires, each received fees of

---

143. ER, 376. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 66, 72.
ER, xi, 246, 255, xii, 182.
144. ER, x, 377. Miscellany of the Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 67.
145. Appendix B/8 (g)

20 marks, as did the Snowdon and Ilay Heralds, while several pursuivants and macers were each paid £10 annually and various messengers 4 marks each year.[146]

Essentially the king's household could be divided into the honorary and the practical. The former type of post was probably confined to ceremonial duties and general supervision of the household department under their control, These offices, the principal usher of the royal chamber, the carver, the keeper of the silver vessels, the pantler, the butler and others, tended to be filled by the offshoot branches of noble or lairdly families. In 1509, only the principal usher of the royal chamber Andrew, lord Avondale, and the royal carver, Patrick, master of Gray, were of direct noble descent. For the cadet branches of several of the leading families in Scotland, service in the royal household seems to have been a principal feature, for, in 1509, members of the Balfour, Douglas, Crichton, Edmonstone and Shaw families were prominent royal employees.[147] The political triumph of the Humes and the Hepburns after the battle of Sauchieburn in 1488, was reflected in the household personnel for 1492. Many of the principal household offices were retained by branches of these families; Alexander Hume became great chamberlain,

---

146. Appendix B/8 (g)

147.

William Edmonstone of Duntreath	-	master of the wine cellar.
James Edmonstone	-	keeper of the silver vessels
Patrick Crichton of Cranstone	-	Pantler.
Peter Crichton	-	Master of the Wardrobe.
Thomas Shaw	-	Master of the Spicery.
Thomas Shaw	-	Principal cook.
Michael Balfour	-	Butler.
William Balfour	-	Doorkeeper.
John Balfour	-	Keeper of stone vessels.
David Balfour	-	Usher of the Hall.
David Balfour	-	In the butlery
William Douglas.	-	Master of the household pantry.
Robert Douglas	-	In the Wine cellar.
James Douglas	-	Harnessmaker.
John Douglas	-	In the winde cellar.

John Hume was master of the wardrobe, Patrick Hume the king's butler, and David Hume was in control of the spicery, while Patrick, lord Hailes, later earl of Bothwell, was master of the king's household, Adam Hepburn of Ogston became master of the king's stables, John Hepburn of Rollandstone was the principal steward, Patrick Hepburn was master of the larder, another Patrick supervised the ale cellar, George Hepburn was the director of the chancery and William Hepburn was the clerk of the register.[148] The need to control the king's household in 1488 resulted in a revolution of personnel, with the leading offices under the control of kinsmen of the dominant families. Other servants within the king's household, namely the furrier, the tailor, James Jacklin the barber, Thomas Shaw the principal cook and the various account clerks, would almost definitely have required some specialist knowledge of their trade or occupation. Concerning the lower eschelons of the royal household, little is known of the background of the servants.[149]

Within the royal household, there was not a large overturn of officers and servants. It would appear that, once appointed, a servant in the royal household retained his office for life. Evidence of long tenures of office within the household is plentiful. Between 1496 and 1510 serveral offices remained in the same hands; Patrick Crichton as pantler, Peter Crichton as master of the wardrobe, the Master of Gray as the king's carver, Thomas French, James Mersar as marshals, William Edmonstone of Duntreath as master of the wine cellar and James Jacklin as the king's barber.[150] Lower in the household scale, the trend was perhaps less obvious, but John Kirkwood served in the larder and William Danielson in the pantry for the entire period stated above.[151] The hereditary

---

148. ER, x, 295, 376-7.

149. See Appendix B/8 (g)

150. Miscellany of Scot.Hist. Soc., ix, 66-7. SRO, Household Papers No.3.

151. Ibid.

association between family and household office was also evident. From around 1496 the office of bulter was held by sir Archibald Edmonstone of Duntreath, and sometime in 1408 the office devolved on his son, William Edmonstone.[152]

The English household official in the mid fifteenth century received a small basic rate of payment, to which were added various allowances and supplements; and those who were lucky enough to gain the king's favour might receive considerable grants on top of these.[153] The dramatic rise of John Russell from the position of gentleman usher to Hanry VII to great fortune and an earldom was quoted as an extreme example.[154] It is likely that a similar situation existed in Scotland and that the basic fee and upkeep within the household were not the only benefits to be gained from royal service. The career of Thomas Shaw, the king's principal cook, represented one of the best examples of a household official whose position was enhanced by royal favour. In the 1492 comptroller's account, Thomas Shaw received an annual pension of 4 marks as a cook, but by 1496, he had become the king's principal cook in succession to James Covin at an annual fee of £10, a position which he occupied for the rest of the reign.[155] From 1502, Thomas also received another annual fee of £10 for his official position in the spicery.[156] In common with other household officers, he received a clothing allowance from the treasurer.[157] In addition, Thomas Shaw frequently received extra annual payments of £10 beyond his normal fee from the customs of Edinburgh for his services to the crown,[158]

---

152. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 66. ER, xiii, 255. Archibald Edmonstone received only the first term payment of his fee in the 1502-3 account, and between 1503 and 1508 the office of butler was held by Patrick Hume of Fastcastle.

153. Myers, The Household of Edward IV, 20.

154. For details see Thompson, Two Centuries of Family History.

155. ER, x, 377. Miscellany of the Scot. Hist., Soc., ix, 66. In 1492, Thomas Shaw was styled 'Cocus', but in 1496 he received the title of "Archicocus" or 'Cocus Principal' as in 1509.

156. ER,xii, 185, xiii, 120, 255.

157. TA, i, 231, ii, 308.

158. ER, x, 479, xii, 468, 596, xiii, 232, 488.

He benefitted substantially from royal grants, for during the reign of James IV, Thomas Shaw was gifted the ward and marriage of John Flemming of Boghall and John Romanois,[159] he was granted the escheated goods of Robert Stewart, a bastard,[160] and became a crown tenant in part of Bondington and half of Drumcors in Linlithgowshire, in Raterne in Strathearn and part holder of the lease of the mill of Railstone in Kilmarnock.[161] It is obvious that Thomas Shaw was frequently favoured by the king and also that he had accumulated sufficient capital from a modest beginning to be able to purchase these concessions. In fact, it was not uncommon for household servants to purchase crown leases, for, it was by this means that Hames Dog a servant in the wardrobe held lands in Menteith and John Douglas, an official in the wine cellar, held lands in Fife.[162] In fact, the career of James Dog was interesting for the insight given into the nature of advancement available to a person employed within the royal household and also into the character of such employees. As younger brother of a relatively insignificant landowner, Walter Dog, one of the few means of advancement available to the many persons in a similar situation to James Dog, apart from entry to holy orders, was to gain admission to the king's household. In 1492 Dog is first recorded as being employed in the royal kitchens with an annual fee of 6 marks and a 35/- allowance for his horse fodder.[163] By 1499 he had moved to the postion of usher of the hall, in 1503 he was stated to be engaged in the king's chamber and by 1508 he was in the wardrobe.[164] Despite these changing designations, it is clear from

---

159. RSS, i, 140, 1557. Concerning the gift of the ward and marriage of the son of John Flemming of Boghall, granted on 22 September 1497, on 10 February 1503-4 he relinquished his right to the gift, which was then granted to John Stirling of Craigbernard. RSS, i, 1019.

160. RSS, i, 570.

161. ER, x, 710, 719, 753, 754, 720, 755, 753, 763, xi, 406, 438, xii, 46, 48, 121, 122, 332, 574, 642, 643, xiii, 648. RSS, i, 387, 1070. Under the privy seal, Thomas Shaw received two letters of tack of the lands and coalmine of Bondington both for the period of nine years.

162. John Douglas was a tenant in the lands of Balbreky, which he held in feufarm, and a quarter of the king's barns. ER, xii, 284, 620, 621.

163. ER, x, 378.

164. ER, xi, 247, 256, xii, 182, xiii, 120.

the evidence extracted from the accounts of the treasurer that Dog was actively engaged in supplying the royal wardrobe from at least 1489.[165] The wardrobe was an important department of the household, engaged not only in supplying clothing to the king and his family but also liveries to the many household servants. There are frequent entries in the treasurer's discharge of items of clothing bound for the king's use being received by Dog,[166] of purchases being undertaken by Dog for the royal wardrobe [167] and of his taking charge of the conveyance of the wardrobe during the royal itinery.[168] From the 'bill of Household' arranged in 1507 James Dog was termed a servant in the wardrobe department and although permitted no servants at royal expense, he was, nevertheless, quoted immediately beneath sir Patrick Crichton, the master of the wardrobe.[169] It is like that he performed the actual organisation of the wardrobe, supervising the many additions to royal stocks of clothing. Throughout the reign of James IV, he was in receipt of an official fee of 6 marks and a fodder allowance of 35/- from the comptroller, although in 1499 he was permitted an additional allowance of £4-10/- for his grooms in the wardrobe.[170] From 1490 he was granted livery supplies in common with other members of the king's household.[171] Towards the end of the reign it would appear that James Dog was involved in organizing the wardrobe of queen Margaret.[172] What is also clear was that James Dog was always alive to the possibility of material advancement. It is obvious from his dabbling in real estate that there was more to be made out of royal service than the official fee payable to various servants. Dog undoubtedly exploited his position to

---

165. TA, i, 146.
166. TA, i, 233, 225-6, 256.
167. TA, i, 223-4, 330, 333, ii, 20, 109, 124.
168. TA, i, 297, 308-9.
169. SRO, Household Paper, E 34/1
170. ER, x, 378-9, xi, 247, 256, 257, xii, 182, xiii, 120.
171. TA, i, 191-2, 231, iv, 52, 265.
172. TA, iv, 208, 213-4, 218, 423-5.

the full although unfortunately there is no evidence as to how he went about this. His position in the wardrobe and other household departments must have brought him into contact with the more dubious dealing usual in court circles, and also that king's financial difficulties must have enabled him to extract more tangible concessions from the crown as a means of repaying outstanding debts. James Dog gained part of the lease of the lands of Wester and Middle Coldheuch, paying an annual rental of £5-6-8 by 1508, the feu of a small portion of the lands of Cessintuly and, from January 1495-6, the lease of the lands of Ernelaw and Kip at an annual farm of £10, all within the earldom of Menteith.[173] In addition, it was not uncommon for grassum levies to be remitted to James Dog and when he entered into part tenancy with his brother in the lands of Wester Coldheuch on 10 July 1491 his entry fine was waived as he was a member of the king's household.[174] Also in 1491 he was granted the lands of Auchenbannow in Perthshire on the resignation of his brother, Alexander, canon of Inchmahome and almost 9 years later, on 20 May 1500, he purchased the estate of Dunrobin in Perthshire from Andrew Smith.[175] Through a combination of royal leases and purchases, James Dog, undoubtedly backed by royal favour, became a fairly substantial landholder in Perthshire. It is clear that James IV put considerable trust in the ability and honesty of Dog, for, from May 1508 until the end of the reign, he held the office of chamberlain of the earldom of Menteith.[176] Concerning the actual character of James Dog, as related by William Dunbar in two separate small poems, there is little to contradict the impression of Dog as an efficient, ambitious man engaged in royal service for the prestige and benefits it

---

173. ER, x, 684, 722, xi, 414, 415, xii, 632-3, xiii, 630-636.

174. ER, x, 684, xii, 144.

175. RSS, i, 530. RMS, ii, 2059.

176. ER, xiii, 189, 194, 321, 529.

could bring. Dunbar explicitly states that Dog was a trusty servant, efficient in the discharging of his duties:

'Zour heines can nocht get ane meter,
To keip zour wardrobe, not discreter,
To rule zour robbis, and dress the sam;
He is na Dog; he is a Lam.'

but Dunbar is also careful to point out that he could be rather unpleasant towards persons of lower status;

'Quhen that I schawe to him zour wryting,
He girnis that I am red fro byting;
I wald he had ane hawye clog;
Madame, ze haff a dangerouss Dog.' [177]

As the reign of James IV progressed, the royal household became more sophisticated in arrangement, resulting in the employment of more servants. Between the 1490s and the first decade of the sixteenth century the cost of household fees and pensions in the comptroller's discharge rose from between £500 and £550 annually to between £750 and £800 yearly.[178] The increase in the extent of household fees and pensions during the course of the reign of James IV was largely the result of two forces. Firstly, there was an increase in the number of servants empoloyed by the king within his household. During the year 1496 there were ninety three separate entries of fees paid to household servants, while in 1509, the number had risen to one hundred and eight.[179] Part of this increase took

---

177. Poems of William Dunbar, Vol. ii.

178. See Appendix B/8 (d).

179.

	1496	1509
£20	2	2
20 Marks	12	17
£10	13	17
10 Marks	-	1
6 Marks	17	19
5 Marks	6	7
4 Marks	33	35
2 Marks	5	5
Turnspits	5	5
TOTAL	93	108

place within the household departments themselves, since, between 1496 and 1509 the number of marshals had risen from four to seven.[180] However, the movement whereby the comptroller became responsible for the fees and pensions of all household officers fully implemented in the reign of James V had its origins in the reign of James IV. In the early part of the reign of James IV, the fee of sir William Campbell, macer, at £10 annually, had been levied from the farms of Hairshaw, Bowarshaw and Dryrig in Stewarton, and Little Hairshaw in Kilmarnock, but by 1502, payment became the responsibility of the comptroller.[181] After 1500, the comptroller's discharge recorded the fees of household officers not previously under his control, namely £20 annually to sir John Forman, the principal porter, 20 marks annually to two esquires and two heralds, £10 to three pursuivants and two macers, and 4 marks to nine messengers and to William Dylly crossbowman.[182] Secondly, during James IV's reign, certain household servants received increased allowances. From the 1503 account, Andrew lord Avondale, principal usher of the royal chamber, William Edmonston, butler, Alexander Balfour, in the buttery, and Andrew Doule in the royal stables gained payments of 10 marks, 5 marks, 2 mars and 2 marks respectively 'beyond their fees'.[183] In 1496, John Watson, as keeper of the pewter vessels, received an annual fee of 4 marks, but in 1509, John Balfour, in the same office, was paid 10 marks annually.[184] The interaction of these factors mentioned above increased the amount payable by the comptroller in household fees by at least half as much again.

---

180. In 1496, the four marshals were David Forsyth, James Merser, Thomas French and Walter Lesley. In 1509, Thomas French and James Merser still occupied the office and the others were sir John Stewart, John Inglis, Thomas Forrester, Thomas Bikkerton, and Robert Callendar.

181. ER, x, 92, 110, 159, 211, 266, 272 338, 415, 496, 630, 695, 696, 700, 744, xi, 108, 260, xii, 185.

182. Appendix B/8 (g)

183. ER, xii, 182.

184. ER, x, 377, xiii, 256.

A further increase in fees in the comptrollers' discharges of 1508, 1509, 1510, resulted from the inclusion of allowances for the queen's household servants, whose annual fees and horse fodder amounted to £241-13-4, £232-13-4 and £236-3-4 respectively.[185] The queen's household was organised on the same lines as that of the king. Yet, some household officers retained different positons on the hierarchical scales of the two households; the officer of carver received a fee of £20 annually in the queen's household, but only 20 marks in the king's.[186] It was not uncommon for the same person to hold both offices in the two households. James Edmonstone, for instance, was keeper of the king's silver vessels at a fee of £20 annually and also of the queen's at a smaller annual fee of 6 marks.[187]

As well as annual fees, many household officials, usually between 30 and 37, received an annual allowance of 35/- for horse fodder.[188] During the reign of James IV neither the payments given nor the number of persons receiving them altered to any extent.[189]

The upkeep of the royal household was the principal and most expensive feature of the comptroller's accounts. In 1495-6, the total expense of the king's household including the cost of provisioning and official's fees, amounted to £6,841-17-6, while in 1510, the cost had risen to a total of £12,942-8-3. Although household expenses doubled during the reign of James IV, there was no attempt at retrenchment until the reign of James V and even then only the surface was scratched.[190]

---

185. ER, xiii, 126-7, 258-9. SRO, Household Papers No.3.
186. ER, xiii, 255, 258.
187. ER, xiii, 255, 258.
188. ER, x, 379, xiii, 257-8.
189. Appendix B/8 (d)
190. ADC, iii, 251. An attempt by James V to restrict the fees of household officers to the rates paid by James IV.

However, in England, the financial instability of the royal household under Henry Vi necessitated attempts at reorganization and retrenchment. The ordinances of 1445 and 1478, and the Black Book of the household of Edward IV were designed to reduce the number of authorized household officials and to economize on the amounts of food, fuel and light used in the household.[191]

The remainder of the comptroller's discharge was composed of a variety of miscellaneous allowances. The most costly item was concerned with the field of diplomacy. Diplomatic expenses were shared between the comptroller and the treasurer, the latter dealing mostly with the cost of sending ambassadors from Scotland to foreign courts and the granting of gifts to departing foreign ambassadors.[192] However, the comptroller sustained the cost of provisioning and housing foreign embassies for the duration of their residence in Scotland. The total outlay for the sustenance of the French embassy of Barrald, count of Beaumont, who died during his stay in Scotland, the president of the Paris Parlement and sixty other persons from the 9 May 1508 to the 1 February 1508-9, amounted to £1,933-3-8, 7 chalders, 4 bolls of wheat and 2 chalders, 4 bolls of malt.[193] From 1495 to 1498, ambassadors from Spain were regular visitors to Scotland. The comptroller was allowed £139-3-7 for their expenses for December 1495 and January 1496, £34-5-5 for eleven days in 1497 and £266 for their expenses in 1498.[194] Sir Duncan Forrester, comptroller, expended £115-12/- for the expenses of Doctor Middleton and other English ambassadors from 13 January to the 1 February 1497-8.[195]

---

191. For details concerning the financial reorganization of the household under Edward IV, see Myers, The Household of Edward IV.

192. For details, see the Treasurers' Accounts under the section 'miscellaneous expenses' or expenses 'ad extra'.

193. ER, xii, 123, 247-8.

194. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 68, 71, 84.

195. ER, xi, 248-9.

After 1424, responsibility for the expenses of the Exchequer shifted from the chamberlain to the comptroller. During the reign of James IV, the comptroller was liable for the annual expenses of the exchequer, ranging between £150 and £250 annually. In 1509, the total expense arrived at £267-4-10, which included £168-17-8 and 2 chalders 8 bolls of wheat from Moray for the expenses of the auditors from 13 June to the 11 August, £22 for the fee and robe allowance of the clerk of the register, £25 for the clerks of the household and the chancery and for clerks copying the rolls, £10 for the hire of the Dominican monastery of Edinburgh for the Exchequer £2 for minstrels, and other small payments for parchment, tables, benches and the expenses of persons connected with the exchequer.[196]

In the 1453 account of George Shoriswood, the comptroller's substitute received an allowance of £318-4-11 as part of the cost of the military preparations for the siege of the Tower of Hatton. These military expenses included the best of transporting and maintaining the king's bombard, the construction of the 'sow', the supply of raw materials and payments to masons and carpenters and the provision of spears, bows, cannon stones and iron helmets. The expense total also included the cost of hiring soldiers for the operation, for £15 was allowed to sir Walter Scot as a fee for the service of certain men from Teviotdale.[197]

The remaining discharges to the comptroller were of an extremely haphazard nature. In 1497, £80 was allowed to the comptroller for the upkeep and expenses of Ranald Roy, son of sir John Islay, who had been hanged by the king at Kintyre,[198] while the following account of

---

196. ER, xiii, 259-60.

197. ER, v, 606-7.

198. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 74-5. There was a clothing allowance to Ranald Roy in November 1497 and it is probable that he was in the king's ward at this time. On the capture of Dunaverty Castle by MacIan of Ardnamurchan, John MacDonald of Islay was also captured and sent for execution with three of his sons to Edinburgh (not Kintyre). Cunningham, The Loyal Clans, 59.

sir Duncan Forrester, £73-11-4, the cost of provisioning a ship for the servants of the Duke or York, was recorded in the discharge.[199] Also in the latter account, £100 was paid for the 'bark' of E.W'.[200] There was little logic in these entries, which were similar to those recorded in the treasurers' accounts. In 1498, sir Duncan Forrester, comptroller, was allowed £12-14/- for the expenses of the earl of Sutherland at Edinburgh.[201] By a decree of the lords of the Council, dated 9 February 1497-8, sir James Dunbar of Cummock, the earl's tutor under the terms of the decision following the issue of a brieve of idiotry against the earl, was required, at his own expense, to transport the earl of Sutherland and his son to the king 'that he may consider and provyd how thai salbe rewlit according til thare estait efferand to thare leving'.[202] While in the king's charge, the cost of their upkeep 'according til thare extait' would have been sustained by the crown and this entry in the comptroller's account was undoubtedly part of it. The comptroller also sustained certain administrative costs. In 1497, sir Duncan Forrester was responsible for the expenses of the commissioners engaged in leasing various portions of crown demesne to the tune of £76.[203] In the same account £20 was paid to certain messengers, who travelled the countryside collecting farms and grassums,[204] In several accounts, the comptroller received up to £80 for his work and expenses in collecting revenue and purchasing provisions for the royal household at various fairs.[205]

---

199. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 81. The Duke of York was in fact Perkin Warbeck. The provisions were delivered to Rolland Robinson, his servant, who also received several cash payments from the treasurer for the Duke's expenses.
200. ER, x, 249.
201. ADC, i, 378, 379. TA, i, 221. ADC, ii, 107.
202.
203. Miscellany of Scot. Hist., Soc., ix, 74. Part of this entry is Missing and only Carrick ('Carrac') was named as being leased by the commissioners.
204. Ibid, 74
205. ER, x, 379, xiii, 123.

Information concerning the financial position of the crown is extremely scanty beyond the surviving comptroller's accounts, Although isolated references in the exchequer rolls and other sources give pointers as to the crown's solvency, conclusions are, by necessity, based on very thin evidence.

From the accounts of the royal customers during the period 1424-35 and the fate of the majority of the cash raised for the ransom of James I, it would appear that the expenses of James I were of a liberal nature. In order to raise the status of the Scottish monarchy, James I required not only to establish a solid territorial basis but also to establish a court, with sufficient prestige and magnificence to attract the presence and admiration of even the greatest subject. As the English court vied with the court of Burgundy, whose fashions and forms of management were copied all over Western Europe, so the Scottish court under James I found its model in England, where James had spent his formative years.[206] The result was a sudden expolsion in spending on an overwhelming variety of items, usually under the term 'furnishings'. James entered into transactions with both foreign and London merchants, men like John Lemman of London and his servant, Watkin Bruk, Thomas Bernwell and Thomas Weston also of London, Peregrina and Lazarine Grellus of Genoa, and Dominic de Villanis of Florence, to whom payments were recorded in the custumers' accounts in cash, salted salmon and customs remissions.[207] James I also entered into commercial business with home based merchants, especially with John Turyne, burgess of Edinburgh, who received payments from the customs accounts and a considerable portion of the king's ransom, and in 1436 rendered a detailed account of his purchases for the king in Flanders.[208] As the offices of comptroller and treasurer were still in

---

206. Myers, Household of Edward IV, 3

207. For details, see chapter on custumars' accounts.

208. ER, iv, 412, 437, 438, 472, 672-685.

their infancy, it is likely that James found it expedient to treat with these merchants directly from the income from the great customs and royal ransom and thus a detailed examination of these arrangements has been confined to the chapter on the custumers' accounts.

From what evidence has survived, it would appear that the reign of James II was one of considerable financial difficulty and the crown was forced to adopt a veriety of fiscal manoeuvres to alleviate the situation. Between 1438 and 1460 there were no less than seventeen occasions when the office of comptroller changed hands, thus making the average length of tenure just over a year.[209] Unfortunately, the accounts of the majority of these comptrollers have failed to survive, but of those that did, that of Alexander Napier in 1450 revealed a deficit of £1,315-15-10 over the year,[210] that of George Shoriswood, standing in for Alexander Nairn who was absent in England in 1452 recorded a smaller loss of £151-7/-,[211] while the account of Ninian Spot in 1456 also revealed a deficit of £21-7-9.[212] Concerning the deficit of George Shoriswood a memorandum at the foot of the account stated that the debt was cleared by a payment of £100 from the customs of Aberdeen in 1454 and £51-7/- from the account of the chancery in 1457.[213] In 1450, the account of Alexander Napier revealed the inadequacy of the income from the great customs, the burgh farms and the royal property to meet the increasing expenses of the king's household. Alexander Napier, in order to achieve any sort of balance, was forced to draw on payments from the Abbot of Melrose, treasurer (£221-3-4), William, bishop of Glasgow(£108) and Robert Nory (£66-13-4), loans totalling £986-12/- from Edinburgh merchants (£131), lord Crichton, the Chancellor (£500), the bishop of St.Andrews (200), William earl of Douglas (£100),

---

209. List of comptrollers, Appendix A/1(b)
210. ER, v, 397.
211. ER, v, 608.
212. ER, vi, 289 Although Ninian Spot was not designated 'comptroller', his receipts and allowances were similar to those of the other surviving comptroller accounts.
213. ER, v, 608.

Richard Farnlee and George Berwick, burgesses of Edinburgh (£50) and £5-12/- from unknown persons for seven marts, as well as the issues of crown compositions and casualties.[214] Despite these large subsidiary payments, the comptroller still incurred a deficit of over £1,300. The 1452 comptroller's account also received considerable assistance, a £50 loan from the bishop of St.Andrews and 400 marks from the composition paid for two great seal letters granted to William Gifford and the burgh of Cupar.[215] The account of Ninian Spot in 1456 was aided by payments of £449-7/- from the treasurer and £70 from the dean of Glasgow, keeper of the Privy Seal.[216]

At the outset of the reign, many of the crown's financila problems stemmed from the outstanding debts of James I. A considerable portion of the late king's debts had been incurred in Flanders, and, in the 1438 accounts of the custumers of Linlithgow and Edinburgh and the account of the receiver of king's lands within the sheriffdom of Aberdeen, William Bully and Robert Nory were paid a total of £400 in Flemish groats of £939-3-1 Scots to repay a debt of James I to Flemish merchants.[217] On the 16 February 1436-7, John Fife, burgess of Aberdeen, advanced a considerable sum of money to James I and for his repayment, be obtained a precept upon the chamberlain of Mar, but the Whitsun and Martinmas terms' rents of the earldom had already been assigned to the burgesses and merchants of Aberdeen for the royal debts in Flanders and John Fife was forced to seek his repayment from other farms or customs within the sheriffdom of Aberdeen.[218]

During the reign of James II, the crown, because of the relatively weak position of the comptroller, was forced to rely on other persons to support the royal financial system. William Bully, burgess of Edinburgh

---

214. ER, v, 393-5.
215. ER, v, 604.
216. ER, vi, 289.
217. ER, v, 22, 32, 33, 52.
218. ER, v, 10.

was frequently used to support many of the king's expenses and purchases. He paid for gilted silk cloth purchased for the king in Flanders, and, by an assignment dated 7 August 1442, received 20 marks annually from the customs of Edinburgh for his outlay of £51 Flemish groats, and although the payments were regularly made, when they ceased in 1454 with £18-13-4 still remained owing.[219] In 1452 William Bully was paid only £24-16-8 of a total debt of £74-10/- owed to him for the expenses of the queen's confessor and his servants.[220] During the 1440s the customs accounts of Edinburgh frequently overexpended, in 1446 to the tune of £573-17-7, and although the following year showed a surplus of £168, by 1450 a large deficit of £1,190-9-8 had accumulated.[221] A survey of the cusumer's account for this period would suggest that the king employed these accounts to sustain expenses which later became the resonsibility of either the comptroller or the treasurer. Apart from regular payments to the comptroller, the Edinburgh custumers were required to meet the cost of the purchase of cloths, linen, silk and furs for the royal family and their servants, the cost of diverse 'furnishings' supplied by individual merchants large payments and customs allowances, probably in return for services to the crown or as a means of settling debts.[222] During this period of heavy assignment on the Edinburgh customs, William Bylly acted as one of tho customers, an office he retained from 1442 until 1452 with only one break during the year 1450-1.[223] By this means, the crown employed the resources of Bully to gain temporary relief from the immediate financial demands of heavy spending. When the situation eased, William Bully was ropaid in

---

219. ER, v, 148, 222, 273, 309, 344, 384, 436, 498, 615.
220. ER, v, 500.
221. ER, v, 222, 276, 313, 348, 388.
222. For details, see chaper on the Custumars' Accounts.
223. ER, v, 125, 146, 178, 216, 271, 307, 343, 380, 496.

instalments during the next five years and in the 1457 account, it was declared that full payment of all the rests owing to Bully had now been made.[224]

Adam Cosour, burgess of Stirling seems to have been another crown creditor. As custumer of Stirling, Cosour subsidised the account to the tune of £68-10/- in 1449, although by the following year the debt appears to have been reduced to £52-15/-. In order to clear the debt, James II allowed Adam Cosour and his brothers the right to export their goods from Stirling free of custom until full repayment had been achieved.[225] On the 5 May 1451, the lands of Easter Lockie and the 'offerens' of Shiregartane were granted to Adam Cosour 'for his faithful service', but the Exchequer Rolls revealed that the lands, royal property within the earldom of Menteith, Were in fact mortgaged to Adam for a debt of 300 marks.[226] Although this expedient solved the problem of the debt repayment, it represented a permanent loss of revenue to the crown for since the debt never seems to have been repaid, the lands in question passed permanently out of the crown's hands.[227]

---

224. ER, v, 434, 439, 551, 611, vi, 6, 117, 279. After the 1452 account of the customs of Edinburgh, the debt to William Bully stood at £788-1-10 and during the following years repayment was as follows -

1453	£341-15-1
1454	£330.
1455	£ 60.
1456	£ 50.
1457	£ 55.

Total £806-15-1. However this total may have included the £18-13-4 still owing to Bully from the purchase of the gilted silk cloth (see above).

225. ER, v, 374, 430, 507.

226. RMS, ii, 444. ER, vi, 324.

227. The lands continued in the hands of Adam Cosour until the 13 September 1472 when William, lord Moneypenny gained possession of them on payment of the 300 marks. Ten days later lord Moneypenny resigned the lands to Andrew, lord Avondale whose descendants continued in occupation until at least 1513. The lands of 'Offerens' of Shiregartane continued to be charged to the chamberlain of Menteith, but they were automatically allowed to the occupier.
RMS, ii, 1079, 1080. ER, viii, 70, xiii, 531.

The dramatic rise in the fortunes of Alexander Napier, burgess of Edinburgh, was the combined result of loyal and efficient crown service, and speculation in the financial plight of the crown under James II. Like Adam Cosour, Napier reaped large rewards from financial involvement in royal insolvency, expecially through his receipt of royal property in mortgage. The lands of Merchiston were wadset to Alexander Napier as security for the repayment of royal debts to Napier, and, although attampts were made to clear the outstanding sums, the letter of reversion remained unused in Edinburgh castle and the lands of Merchiston were alienated permanently to Alexander Napier.[228] Later in the reign of James II, Alexander Napier gained temporary possession of the lands of Auldlindoris and Kinloch in the earldom of Fife, mortgaged for the full repayment of an advance of £1,000 to the crown. In 1455, Alexander Napier and Nicholas Spethy were paid £10-6-8 for the release of two silver cups, probably mortgaged by the crown.[229] However, before the feast of Pentecost 1454, James II was successful in releasing the lands from the wadset and thus not repeating the example of Merchiston.[230] During the last decade of his reign, James II seems to have placed considerable confidence in Alexander Napier. On five separate occasions he was appointed to the office of comptroller,[231] while he also served as custumer of Edinburgh,[232] master of works at the siege of Haltoun Tower[233] and was involved in the leasing of the crown lands in Fife and Strathearn.[234] Using his obviously considerable financial resources and his position of favour with the king, Alexander Napier was eager to invest in land. Apart from the lands of

---

228. ER, v, 63. In 1436 the keeper of the privy seal paid £44-6-6 to Alexander Napier. ER, iv, 667. while two years later, a further £20 was paid by the cloth custumer of Edinburgh. ER, v, 26.
229. ER, vi, 3.
230. ER, v, 678, 688.
231. See Appendix A/1 (b) List of comptroller.
232. ER, v, 388, 434, 550, 609, vi, 1, 113, 296.
233. ER, v, 606, 607.
234. ER, v, 374, 583.

Merchison mentioned above, Alexander Napier acquired the lands of Philde in 1449-50 ostensibly for this 'faithful service and injuries sustained in the defence of the queen on the occasion of her imprisonment by sir Alexander Livingston' on the forfeiture of Livingstone,[235] had temporary possession of the lands of Balbartane,[236] possessed a feu charter of the lands of Upper Merchiston from the church of St.Giles and retained the lands of Pulterlands from the king.[237] During the remainder of the fifteenth century and early part of the sixteenth the Napiers continued to expand territorially, especially by dint of the marriage of John Napier of Merchiston and Elizabeth Menteith, one of the co-heiresses of the earldom of Lennox, whereby a quarter of the lands of the earldom were ceded to the Napiers.[238] This advancement from wealthy burgess stock to the ranks of the landed gentry within a hundred years was spectacular and undoubtedly had its origins in the financial dealings of Alexander Napier in the reigns of James I and II. Between 1450 and 1460, Alexander Napier was at the centre of royal financial affairs and his activities revealed the chaotic and confused nature of the king's fiscal arrangements during that decade. Mention has already been made of the unsatisfactory nature of his surviving account as comptroller. In addition, in 1451 Alexander Napier as comptroller, was compelled to borrow £20 from the community of Stirling, of which he received £18-13-4 from the burgh custumer.[239] As custumer of Edinburgh in 1451, Alexander Napier incurred a deficit of £53-3-7 in his account, which was cleared in the following account.[240] On 25 April 1452, Alexander Napier

---

235. RMS, ii, 324.
236. Napier, Memoirs of Napier of Merchiston, 25. On the 15 May 1459, the lands were returned by Alexander Napier to James, earl of Morton. RMS, ii, 699.
237. Napier, Memoirs of Napier of Merchiston, 25.
238. RMS, ii, 3748. Fraser, The Lennox Book, i, 306-7, ii, 134-7.
239. ER, v, 430.
240. ER, v, 439, 500.

of Merchiston issued a bond to the king which fully illustrated the measure of confusion and uncertainty that surrounded his fiscal arrangements. The bond stated that 'giff ony of our saide soverane lordis liegis of officiaris can prufe upon me that I have ressavit ony soumez of mone, rentiis, revenoyis or ony maner of profittis utheris that I have takin on me in my comptis, I sall answer for the saide soumeze in our saide soverane lordis next chakker, like as I have done for the soumeze that I have chargit me with in my saide comptis, nochtwithstanding ony letters of quitclaim given to me be our saide soverane lorde'.[241] In the 1453 account of the Edinburgh customs, Alexander Napier was assigned £174 by the king through his letters under the privy seal, and in the following account, it was recorded that he had received a total of£74 and the remaining £100 was to be taken from another source.[242] In the 1452 account of George Shoriswood, £333-6-8 was received in the comptroller's charge from Alexander Napier as payment for the lands he held of the king in Fife, possibly a reference to the wadset of the lands of Auldlindoris and Kinloch mentioned above.[243] In 1454 £13-8-8 was paid from the customs account of Stirling to Adam Cosour on behalf of Alexander Napier, comptroller, as the rest of a larger sum owed by Alexander for 'furnishings' for the queen's household.[244] In the summer of 1456, Alexander Napier again held the office of comptroller, and he received over £500 towards the expenses of the household from Ninian Spot, prior to accepting the comptrollership himself.[245] Examples of Napier's financial arrangements are unfortunately few in number and not always clear in motivation, but, nevertheless, it would

---

241. Nat. Lib. Adv., charter No.11/2
242. ER, v, 551, 552, 612.
243. ER, v, 605. This entry probably represented a composition payment for a royal charter of the wadset lands.
244. ER, v, 621.
245. ER, vi, 291.

appear that he represented, through his role as comptroller and custumer of Edinburgh and also as a private individual, a principal cog in the machinery of royal finance. Although Napier's financial backing was of great benefit to James II, the former also received his reward, both territorially and in prestige. In his later years, Alexander Napier was frequently employed on diplomatic missions.[246] For these three men, and there were doubtless many others, involvement in the crown's financial difficulties represented an investment, engaged in not so much out of national duty but for profit. By accepting crown land and royal jewelry was security, crown creditors insured themselves against the crown's inability of unwillingness to make full repayment. It was in this way that Alexander Napier gained permanent possession of the lands of Merchiston. However, since such men as Alexander Napier, William Bully and Adam Cosour, who possessed considerable commercial and financial experience, were willing to invest in the difficulties of royal finance, the enterprise must have yielded some return.

The principal burghs frequently came to the financial aid of James II. In 1446 and 1447, the merchants of Linlithgow advanced a total of £41-5/- to James II for his journey into the western areas of Scotland.[247] The burgh of Edinburgh was also active in giving the king financial support, for, in 1447-8 the burgesses lent the king a total of £100 for his expenses at the time of the siege of Edinburgh castle,[248] while in 1450, the £100 owed by the king to William, earl of Douglas was repaid out of the customs account.[249] In 1441 John Vaux, burgess of Aberdeen was repaid fully for the £90 owed to lord Hailes for the redemption of royal jewels which had been pledged for the loan advanced to cover the expenses of lord Gordon and

---

246. Napier, The memoirs of Napier of Merchiston, 22-36.
247. ER, v, 225, 268.
248. ER, v, 276, 310.
249. ER, v, 384.

qther ambassadors on their journey to England.[250] Between 1448 and 1450, James II borrowed a total of £740 Scots or £300 Flemish groats from the burghs of Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Dundee to pay Italian merchants for expenses connected with the purchasing of bulls for the election of William Turnbull to the see of Glasgow.[251]

Apart from financial officials and wealthy burgesses, it would appear that the powerful political figures of the time were expected to lend financial aid to the running costs of the royal court and household. On 12 June 1450, William, lord Crichton, chancellor, was granted the lands of Castlelaw in the sheriffdom of Edinburgh 'for his cordial affection and singular favour, his faithful council and gracious services', and more prectically 'in recompense for the sum of £2,080-14-6 for the expenses of the king's household willingly paid by William ..... and for the sum of £400 delivered to the king in cash'.[252] Obviously unable to repay such a large debt in cash, James II was forced in this case to conced lord Crichton a portion of the royal demesne as compensation.

In 1451, William, earl of Douglas lent the comptroller £100 while, in the same year, Alexander, earl of Huntly was repaid a loan of £30. The rift with the earl of Douglas between 1450 and 1455 revealed that supporters of James II were willing to finance the royal cause. Apart from the contributions of William, lord Crichton, the chancellor, it would seem that James Kennedy, bishop of St.Andrews and William Turnbull, bishop of Glasgow were also active in this respect. In order to finance the raid to the

---

250. ER, v, 219.

251. ER, v, 306, 311, 370. In the Papel Register 'Obligazioni' William Turnbull was recorded as offerring 2500 gold florins for his appointment.

252. RMS, ii, 363. In the 1450 comptroller's account of Alexander Napier, mention is made of a loan of £500 by lord Crichton. The lands of Castlelaw continued in the Crichton family until the forfeiture of William, lord Crichton in 1483-4. APS, ii, 154-164.

borders in 1452, Turnbull advanced the sum of 800 marks from the Jubilee offerings at Glasgow Cathedral and in return for the loan, James II, on the 14 April 1452, assigned the bishop £100 annually from the farms of Bute Arran and Cowal and the great customs of Ayr, Irvine and Dumbarton, until full repayment was achieved.[253] As well as the assignment of crown revenue in the south west of Scotland,[254] the bishop of Glasgow also received remission from export duty and the gift of feudal casualties in the south west shires. Similarly, James Kennedy, bishop of St.Andrews was constantly lending cash to the king, £200 in 1451, £50 in 1452, and in 1456 received £175 as repayment of money owed to him from the Martinmas term of 1455 and for financial aid given to the king's household.[255] In 1455, Kennedy was granted the lands of Auldlinoris, Dunmure and others in Fife, valued at £96-0-10 annually in wadset, and he also collected the farms of the lands of Ballincreiff for the term of Martinmas 1456-7.[256] In addition, Kennedy also benefitted from the gift of crown casualty, remission of customs duty and payments of unknown origin.[257] Financially the campaign against the earl of Douglas was an expensive venture and it was only natural that the king should turn to his supporters for support. However, in the short term, the detrimental effect on the revenue from crown lands and customs was considerable.

---

253. RMS, ii, 542.

254. ER, v, 452-4, 491, 575, 667. The bishop of Glasgow leased the lands of Arran to Ranald McAlister, as permitted under the great seal charter, but he withheld the rents and the sheriff was unable to poind his goods. The bishop died in 1454 and payments to him from crown property seemed to cease after that.

255. ER, v, 393, 604, vi, 117.

256. ER, vi, 81, 252, 359, 370. It is interesting that on three separate occasions the lands of Auldlindoris, Kinloch and other lands in the earldom of Fife were wadset to repay crown debts, namely to Alexander Napier in 1453, the Bishop of St.Andrews in 1455 and Thomas Simpson in 1473.

257. ER, vi, 108, 119, 200.

In the late 1440s, the family of Livingstone had attained a position of political dominance in Scotland, This power was achieved and maintained through the extensive acquisition of office: sir Alexander Livingstone was royal justiciar, James was royal chamberlain, Robert, burgess of Linlithgow was comptroller, John held the office of master of the mint and the family were also entrenched in the castles of Stirling, Dumbarton, Doune and Methven.[258] As well as a monopoly of official posts, the evidence suggests that royal finances during this period were heavily burdened by the fiscal claims of the Livingstone connection.[259] Although sir Alexander Livingstone of Callendar acted in an extremely high handed fashion in 1439 when he secured the violent arrest of the queen and although the Livingstone factinn held the crown in check for the next decade, the explanation of their sudden fall in 1449 is more involved than mere retribution for such offences. Lack of information concerning this political revolution makes any assessment little more than conjecture, but, despite the fact that all members of the Livingstone connection were arrested, only Alexander Livingston, keeper of Methven Castle and Rober Livingstone, comptroller, suffered execution.[260] There is sufficient evidence to suppose that financial and territorial considerations played some part in the turn of events. On 22 August, 1449, Robert Livingstone, comptroller, received a bond from James II for £930 due to him from his account which was to be paid in Flemish coin at Bruges on 1 April 1450 out of the queen's dowry.[261]

---

258. Donaldson, Scottish Kings, 85.

259. See the chapter on Custumars' Accounts.

260. In fact, sir James Livingstone was quickly reaccepted into royal favour, for before July 1454 he was reinstated in the office of chamberlain, and received back his own lands and those of his father. In 1455 was created lord Livingstone. RMS, ii, 606.

261. Fraser, Stirling of Keir, 224-5.

In common with other comptrollers during the reign of James II, Robert Lvingstone was unable to balance his account and seems to have been pressing for repayment. However, with the fall of the Livingstone monopoly and the forfeiture and execution of Robert, the king was absolved from the need to find such a large sum of money. *Further evidence of the adverse* financial position of Robert Livingstone occurred in 1451 when James II assigned £123-13-7 to satisfy the poor creditors of the comptroller, who had supplied the royal household with goods and cash before the fall of Robert Livingstone.[262] Beoce asserted that the surviving Liveringstones purchased their remissions with large cash payments. There is little supporting evidence except an entry in the comptroller's account of Alexander Napier in 1450, recording the receipt of a composition of 100 marks from Thomas Berwick on behalf of his son-in-law, James Livingstone.[263] Despite the vagueness of the evidence, it would appear that James II had much to gain financially from the removal of the Livingstones.[264]

Thus for most of the reign of James II, the crown was in an extremely precarious financial state, with expenditure far outpacing the revenue collected. From the meagre evidence available, there can be little doubt that the crisis years of the early 1450s cost the crown dearly, both in appropriated reveneues and wasted property and also in the fact that a substantial proportion of potential income was being assigned to royal supporters so as to maintain their support and to aid their contribution to the royal cause. The heavy cost of military equipment - Mons Meg and several other bombards and smaller ordnance were purchased at this time - coupled with the obvious inadequacy of royal income must have resulted in something of a financial crisis for the crown. As seen above, various

---

262. ER, v, 471.

263, ER, v, 396. lxxxi.

264. Further incentives for the removal of the Livingstone faction has been included in the section dealing with forfeited estates, in the chapter concerned with crown land.

fiscal expedients were employed by the crown to offset this adverse trend and various persons, of both political and mercantile interest, were seen to give financial assistance to the comptroller. Evidence for the last five years of the reign is even more scanty than the earlier years, but it would appear that from 1455 to 1460, the crown's financial position showed signs of improvement. Certainly no comptroller's accounts have survived for this period, but even in the local 'Ballivi ad Extra' or customers' accounts, there is little evidence of borrowing by the crown. In 1456, the custumer of Edinburgh submitted £10 to Nicholas Spethy as repayment of the loan to the comptroller, Master Richard Forbes, the year before.[265] However, there existed no similar entries for the reamining years of the reign of James II. However, between 1 February 1456-7 and 25 July 1457 Andrew Crawford, a burgess of Edinburgh was sent to Flanders to raise cash on the security of a tax levied on the Scottish burghs and loans raised from individual merchants. At the latter date Crawford accounted for a total of £100-8/- in Flemish groats and £98-7-6 Scots from the burghs and a further £92-16-8 Flemish from various named merchants, mostly from the burgh of Edinburgh, and the proceeds from this revenue were expended in Flanders on the costs of an embassy and also on the purchase of foreign merchandise, especially winde, drugs and military itemms, namely powder, saltpetre, iron, arrow, sulphur and arrows. There seems to have been an element of compulsion in the arrangement for Crawford was allowed £1 for his expenses concerning the arrest of goods from Aberdeen, Dundee, Cupar and Perth in Flanders in defect of their not submitted the extent owed by these burghs.[266] The timing of this improvement in the king's financial position coincided with the forfeiture of the vast Douglas inheritance in 1455.[267] For the first time the 'Ballivi ad Extra' contained accounts

---

265. ER, vi, 118.
266. ER, vi, 305-11.
267. APS, ii, 42, 75-7.

of landed property within the lordship of Galloway, Ettrick Forest, the earldom of Moray, the lordship of Balvanie, and other large estates in the north. It seems likely that the annual returns from the Douglas estates temporarily boosted royal income sufficiently to meet the considerable household cost and thus relieving the pressure on the crown.

Evidence concerning the financial position under James II is derived entirely from external sources as no comptroller's accounts have survived for that period. From the surviving evidence, there seems little doubt that the finances of James III were frequently in confusion and seldom seem to have recorded a profit. It would appear that many of the comptrollers were persistantly recording deficits and some were forced to delay their final account until the situation was clarified. Sir Alexander Napier continued in the office of comptroller after the death of James II in 1460 and received a final discharge on 7 July 1461.[268] In order to balance this account, it would appear that sir Alexander Napier borrowed £122-10-2 from the queen which was partly repaid to Michael Balfour, on the queen's behalf, from the account of the 'receiver' of Strathbran, Glenlyon and other lands in Perthshire.[269] In 1472 James Shaw of Sauchie incurred superexpenses of at least £41-1-9 which were cleared the following year from the account of the chamberlain of the lordship of Stirlingshire.[270] In the late 1480s both Alexander Leslie of Wardris and Thomas Simpson found it impossible to clear their accounts.[271] Against the prevailing

---

268. ER, vii, 111. Napier, Napier of Merchiston, 21-2.

269. ER, vii, 111. Even after the death of James II, sir Alexander Napier continued in the service of the crown. In 1464, with others, Napier was appointed a searcher for the port of Leith to prevent the export of gold and silver, and in 1473 he was again quoted as 'searching for the money'. In 1467 he was one of the commissioners for the tax raised from the barons. Napier, Napier of Merchiston, 21-22.

270. ER, viii, 161.

271. ER, ix, 303, 338, 361, 457.

tide, George Robinson, comptroller from 3 June 1486 until 8 March 1487-8, seems to have made a profit during his term of office. On the 24 January 1504-5, a decree was given by the lords of the council against his son for £408-17-8, 10 chalders, 10 bolls, 3 firlots, 1 peck of wheat, 20 chalders, 9 bolls, 2 firlots, 2 pecks of bere and 2 lasts, 3 barrels of salmon 'restand upon the said un quhile George, his fader, the tyme he was comptrollere to our soverane lordis fader'.[272] Throughout the entire reign of James III the crown was involved in borrowing sums of money from its subjects. In 1462 James, lord Livingstone received a total of £77-18/- as part repayment for two loans to the king of £100 and £200.[273] During the visit of Margaret of Anjou, queen of England, to Scotland soon after the death of James II, Master James Lindsay, keeper of the privy seal was forced to borrow to meet her expenses since £50 was repaid to William Bonar for the loan of 100 crowns and £40 was returned to David Spalding.[274] The 1464 account of the Edinburgh custumers recorded the total or partial repayment of three debts; of £83-6-8 to the abbot of Holyrood for the queen's debt, £10 to Adam Cant for the redeeming of 5 silver vessels pledged to Adam by the queen for the £10. and £200 owed to Hicholas Spethy by the King.[275] In 1473, £50 was lent to the king from the account of the chamberlain of Fife, while two years later £600 was repaid to the merchants of Edinburgh for their loan to the crown.[276] In 1484, James III began repaying a debt of 500 marks to Isabelle Williamson by allowing her freedom from the export duty levied on her own goods, by which method she recovered £132-13-2 of the entire debt.[277] In the same year Albert Nicholson was

---

272. ADC, 16, f 28.
273. ER, vii, 145.
274. ER, vii, 80.
275. ER, vii, 284-5. Concerning the latter debt of £200, part was assigned to the queen and the remainder to the Minorite friary of Edinburgh.
276. ER, viii, 178, 312.
277. ER, ix, 213, 215, 216, 217.

was repaid £21 which the king confessed was owing to him.[278]

The career of Thomas Simpson of Knockhill fully illustrated the confused nature of the fiscal arrangements under James III. In order to spread the burden over a wider area, Thomas Simpson was appointed to the two principal and most lucrative local fiscal offices, namely the receiver of Fife from Whitsunday 1464 and the office of Steward and chamberlain of the lordship three years later,[279] and the custumer of Edinburgh from the 1 March 1472-3.[280] Also Simpson acted as receiver for the lordship of Bothwell in 1473.[281] Control over these offices spread the net of his personal responsibility as he was able to call on these sources to lend financial support to his accounts as comptroller and also it was in Simpson's interest to extract the maximum from the lordships of Fife and Bothwell and the customs of Edinburgh.[282] Also Thomas Simpson received the designation 'receiver general' instead of comptroller. Although as 'receiver general', Simpson seems to have dealt with the same revenue and met the same expenses as previous comptrollers, the new office probably gave him greater power over the local receivers in an effort to halt the annual loss of revenue. Both trends were indicative of the worsening financial situation. In 1473 the lands of Auldlindoris, Kinloch, west part of Dunmure and others in the earldom of Fife and the lands of Raterne in the earldom of Strathearn, leased at an annual rent of £100, were wadset to Thomas Simpson for the debt of £2,000 owed to him by the crown.[283] For three and a half years, the £100 was allowed annually to the chamberlains of Fife and Strathearn for the above purpose but in 1447 it

---

278. ER, viii, 178, 312.
279. ER, vii, 241, 456.
280. ER, viii, 188.
281. ER, viii, 174.
282. Since the accoutant was personally liable for all his accounts, one account could be used to support another without loss to the crown.
283. ER, viii, 231.

was stated that with £1,700 still remaining the entire sum had been remitted by Thomas Simpson on the 21 February 1476-7.[284] The exact reason behind Simpson's apparent generosity is unknown but it is possible that he was replenished from another source. In 1476, Thomas Simpson received £76-2/- as repayment of royal debt after his dismissal from the office of 'receiver general', and it would appear that the crown was still indebt to Simpson in 1408, when his son received an annual pension of £20 in recompense for his father's expenses during office.[285]

The career of Simpson's successor, Alexander Leslie of Wardris revealed a similar trend. Also styled 'receiver general' until 1482, Leslie, in similar vein to his predecessor, retained various local financial appointments; he had acted as chamberlain of Kintore and other lands in the north east since 1471, and between 1480 and 1481, he was appointed to the offices of receiver of Kinclevin, Deschier and Toyer and chamberlain of Strathearn, while in 1482, he became custumer of Disart and Pittenweem.[286]

Throughout the reign of James III, the crown and its fiscal officers were engaged in a constant struggle to make ends meet. It would appear from those sources that are available that it was a losing battle and simply that the revenue derived from customs, burghs farms and crown lands was again insufficient to achieve a favourable balance. In the early 1480s the situation was further exacerbated by the existance of 'black money', the use of which seems to have created havoc in several of the accounts of local officials, In 1482, Joh, lord Kennedy, chamberlain of the earldom of Carrick, asserted that he had received the farms for the term of whitsun in 'black money' and he compounded with the king's council for the delivery to the comptroller, Alexander Leslie of Wardris of only thirty marts out of the original figure of £51.[287] In 1486, the

---

284. ER, vii, 231, 272, 291, 361, 371, 446.
285. ER, viii, 376. RSS, i, 1730.
286. ER, viii, 83, ix, 110, 112, 118, 211.
287. ER, ix, 196.

chamberlain of Moray complained that Thomas Simpson as comptroller had refused to accept £105 in 'placks' before their declamation and the lords of the Council decreed that Simpson had acted illegally and was to answer for the sum of money involved.[288] There can be little doubt that these currency manipulations contributed to the general lack of confidence in financial arrangements in Scotland, especially between the comptroller and many of the local fiscal officers. In addition, the controversy over the acceptance of 'black money' had serious repercussions on the total income of the comptroller.

Despite the financial difficulties of the comptrollers during the reign of James III the king himself seems to have been successful in building up a large personal fortune in gold and silver. Pitscottie remarked that James II was 'wondrous covettous in conquissing of money rather than the heartis of his barrouns'.[289] This reputation also seems to correspond with the evidence derived from the financial records, for it would appear that James III was actively engaged in hoarding money and at the time of crisis transported large quantities about with him. During the crisis of 1482, the sum of £146 was allowed to George Robinson in his accountas custumer of Edinburgh, since 'he had in keping of ouris and that was takin fra him at Lawdre and withhalding be Alexander Lawdre, of the quhilk we will have the saide George dischargit and the said Alexander callit to mak ws payment tharof'.[290] Similarly during the crisis six years later, the king's accumulated wealth left Edinburgh with James III in February 1487-8, and, from a subsequent parliamentary inquiry which complained that 'our soverane lordis fader.....haid gret tressor and substance of gold and silver cunzeit and uncunzeit and utheris prisious jowellis to grete avale. The quhilk tressour and substance com never to

---

288. ER, ix, 363.

289. Pitscottie, History and Chronicles of Scotland, i, 163.

290. ER, ix, 219.

the handis of oure soverane lord that now is bot a small part', it was officially recorded that the majority of the hoard was lost in the confusion of the crisis.[291] Some of the treasure hed, however, been distributed to the king's supporters prior to the battle of Sauchieburn and was later delivered up to the new authorities.[292] However, even if the amount received during the early years of the reign of James IV, namely over £24,500 with an additional £4,000 recovered by Walter Simpson, represented almost the entire fortune of James III, it was, even by Mediaeval standards a large personal hoard.[293] The origin of this large personal fortune is obscure, but a few observations may perhaps shed some light on the problem. Distinct from the royal income passing through the hands of the comptroller and the treasurer, there is some evidence to suggest that James III, like his grandfather and father, possessed a personal income outside the control of either of these officers. Such a situation would not be unique for Partner revealed the existance of such a secret treasury in Rome employed by the later Medieval Popes for their private use. The comparison is striking, for payments from the secret treasury of Pope John XXII were made 'ex coffinis suis' or 'de bursa sua' while several payments recorded in accounts of local financial officers were designated 'in cofras regis' or 'ad proprios usus'.[294] However, in the reign of James III, revenue from these local sources tended to be paid straight to the comptroller, but the existence of 'royal coffers' seems to have continued. Between March 1473-4 and 27 July 1476 the profits from minting gold and silver coins amounted to

---

291. APS, ii, 230.

292. For details concerning the inventory of the Treasury and Jewel House, see the chapter on the Treasurers' accounts.

293. TA, i, 79-87. ER, x, 82, 187, 502.

294. For details, Partner, 'Camera Papae: the Problem of Papel finance in the later Middle Ages, 'Journal of Ecclesiastical History, iii and iv, ER, iv, 381, 383, 412, v, 9, 11, 53, 55.

£56-8-4 and the entire sum was paid into the king's coffers through the receipt of Master William Schevez.[295] Despite these isolated references, the derivation of the body of the revenue paid into the royal coffers will remain a matter of conjecture since no accounts have survived. Such items as the profit from minting and the financial benefits from the debasement of the coinage, loans from foreign merchants and other sources, the profits from royal involvement in mercantile ventures, and the transfer of cash from the treasurer to the king,[296] for his personal use may possibly have brought revenue to the royal coffers. In contrast to the fiscal confusion under James III, the reign of James IV presented a more coherent picture of the solvency of the crown. An assessment of the financial position under James IV is greatly simplified by the existence of several comptrollers' and treasurers' accounts. During the reign, certain comptrollers frequently called on the financial assistance of the treasurer in order to prevent the accumulation of a large deficit. Such an expedient was the result of the inadequacy of the revenue derived from crown lands, customs and burgh farms.

The first eight years of the reign of James IV revealed that the financial situation was far from stable. Between the 23 April 1489 and 1495, a total of £4,673-6-10 had been delivered from the treasurer directly to the comptroller.[297] The support given by the treasurer to the upkeep of the king's household involved not only large payments to the comptroller, but also payments to household officials. On 28 June 1489, the treasurer paid £50 to John Hepburn by the king's command for the household expenses,

---

295. ER, viii, 392.

296. In Rome the Apoltolic Chamber, the principal financial office of the Pope, transferred sums of money to the Pope's private purse and in Scotland, the treasurer made frequent payments from his accounts to the king for his personal use. For details, see the chapter on the treasurers' account. P4

297. TA, i, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 118, 122, 130, 195, 200, 201, 221, 243, 244, 245.

and on the 30 August, the same year, £188-10-8 was submitted to the earl of Bothwell, Master of the Household, for the expenses of the duke of Ross, which the comptoller should have covered.[298] The treasurer's ability to bolster up the accounts of the comptroller with large sums of cash was facilitated by the large windfall of over £24,500 which accrued to the treasurer from the treasure recovered from the late king.[299] Of the early comptrollers in the reign, Master Alexander Inglis received a total of £1,700 from the treasurer, while James Douglas of Pittendreich accounted for £1,600.[300] Even with such large subsidies, a favourable balance could not be achieved, for James Douglas took £159 from the receipts of his own account as chamberlain of Moray to settle his overexpenditure as comptroller.[301] Thus, as in previous reigns, the appointment of the comptroller to subsidiary offices of custumars or property 'receiver' was a useful aid in the attempt to balance the comptroller's account. Thomas Forest, for instance, received little from the treasurer and his superexpenses as comptroller were repaid from his own account as custumer of Linlithgow.[302] The surviving, though fragmentary, account of Hugh Martin revealed that despite a subsidy of £736-9-2 from the treasurer, it finished £843 in the red.[303] However, with the appointment of sir Duncan Forrester to the office of comptroller, which he held from 1492 to 1498, there was a steady improvement in the situation. After an indifferent beginning, when he was overexpended to the tune of £1,811 in December 1495 and £3,594 by December the following year, Forrester succeeded in reducing the

---

298. TA, i, 114, 118.
299. TA, i, 166-7.
300. TA, i, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 118, 122, 130.
301. ER, x, 190.
302. TA, i, 195. He received only £123-8/- from the treasurer.
ER, x, 353, 461, 533, 605.
303. ER, x, 371-9.

deficit to £2,907 by August 1497 and in May 1498 actually acheived a surplus of £5-17-6. Concerning the last two accounts, both recorded a substantial profit within the context of the individual accounts, £596 in 1497 and £3,003 in 1498.[304] On 27 May 1500 a precept of quittance was issued to sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch of all sums of money and kind and the 'rest of al maner of proffitis and dewiteiz in the fute of his comptis for the quhilkis he componit with our soverance lordis thesaurar' which he handled during his tenure as comptroller between July 1492 and 10 November 1498.[305] Although the account for the period May to November 1498 is incomplete, it would appear from the terms of the quittance, that Duncan Forrester achieved a favourable balance at the termination of his tenure of office. Similarly, the next comptroller, sir Patrick Hume of Polworth, also gained a surplus. During the last few years of the fifteenth century, sir Patrick Hume, as well as being comptroller, was chamberlain of Stirlingshire, Fife, Kilmarnock and 'receiver' of Ballincreiff and Gosford.[306] On 1 January 1503-4, his wife, Helen Shaw, compounded with the treasurer for the total rest of sir Patrick Hume, totalling £938-12-9 and 40 chalders of victuals of which £595-17-6 was derived from his account as comptroller.[307] It is also significant that the improvement in the financial position of the comptroller under sir Duncan Forrester and sir Patrick Hume was achieved without the assistance of the treasurer.

Generally the financial position deteriorated from 1500 to 1513, but nevertheless the situation tended to fluctuate considerably. A significant factor was the increase in both the charge and discharge side of the comptrollers' accounts, the former the result of greater exploitation of the king's landed property through longer leases, feuing

---

304. Appendix B/8(h)

305. RSS, i, 531.

306. ER, xi, 208, 212, 289, 357.

307 RSS, i, 1010. ER, xi, 260.

and greater efficienty in the accounting of local officials, and the latter through the dramatic increase in the costs of the king's household. Of the surviving accounts, that of John Stirling in 1503 transformed a £735 surplus from the previous account into a £990 deficit, although the situation was slightly distorted by the vast outlay of the king's marriage.[308] By September 1508 James Redheuch had incurred a loss of £136[309] while the 1508-9 account of sir Duncan Forrester showed a profit of £241-7-6.[310] Again this period witnessed the financial interference of the treasurer in the accounts of the comptroller. The financial support given by the treasurer was both considerable and consistent: between September 1502 and February 1504-5, £5,294-4-7 to cover the expenses of the king's marriage, between the latter date and August 1506, £7,372-18-1, with £4,355-16-10 and £6,804-18-4 respectively for the next two years. The result was that from 1502 and 1508, the treasurer had subsidised the comptroller's accounts to the tune of £23,828.[311] Such payments were reflected in the surviving comptrollers' accounts, but it is significant that in the 1508-9 account of sir Duncan Forrester, there are no such payments. Again, in the treasurer's account of 1512-3, a further payment of £896 was made to the comptroller to ease the burden of the rising household expenses.[312] The payments by the treasurer made a significant contribution to the accounts of the comptroller, for in the 1508 account of James Redheuch of Tullichedill, £5,271 out of a total charge of £16,159, almost one third, originated from the treasurer, without which the comptroller would have been unable to meet the expenses of the king's household.[313]

---

308. ER, xii, 175-186.
309. ER, xiii, 248.
310. ER, xiii, 260.
311. TA, ii, iii, iv.
312. TA, iv, 446.
313. TA, iv, 27. ER, xiii, 118-9.

During the last thirteen years of the reign of James IV, the offices of comptroller and treasurer were combined on two occasions, firstly in 1500 under sir Robert Lundy of Balcony and secondly in 1511-2 under Andrew Steward, bishop of Caithness. The rapid overturn of occumpants of the office of comptroller suggested that it was not regarded as an easy task. Little is knownabout the fate of most of the comptrollers, but, nevertheless, there is evidence to suggest that some of them turned the situation to their own advantage. Mention has already been made of the manner in which Alexander Napier of Merchiston used the situation of the crown's poverty to his own advantage. In the reign of James III, Alexander Leslie of Wardris seems to have incurred a deficit during his period of office as comptroller and as a means of repaying the debt, the crown granted to his heir, John Leslie, the office of baillie of the lands of the regality of Garioch and confirmation of a crown feu charter to the lands of the thanage of Kintore, both 'for his good service and in recompense for the sums owed by the late James III to the late Alexander Lesie of Wardris the time he was comptroller'.[314]

In the following reign two men, Duncan Forrester and James Redheuch both at the centre of the king's financial system, advanced financially and socially during and after the period of their comptrollerships. Duncan Forrester, originally a burgess of Stirling, held the office of comptroller from 31 July 1492 to 10 November 1498 and again from 1 September 1508 to sometime after 9 November 1510 and he acted as custumer of Stirling since the reign of James III.[315] However, from 1495

---

314. RMS, ii, 3242, 3244. Antiquities of the shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iii, 233, iv, 520-2.

315. Appendix A/1(b) List of Comptrollers. ER, ix, 66. During the latter part of the reign of James III, Forrester was keeper of Stirling castle. ER, ix, 3, 169, and held a lease of the lands of Oldpark and Raploch in Strilingshire ER, ix, 568.

Forrester's position advanced dramatically, in that year he received a royal grant of the lands of Skipinch, valued at 36 marks annually, which were united into a free barony, and in the following year, the lands of Garden-Sinclair in Menteith and Mye and Finneich-Tennand in the earldom of Lennox, resigned by Walter Makclery of Garden, were granted to Duncan Forrester.[316] Forrester seems to have possessed sufficient capital to have invested in the land market; in 1508 he purchased the lands of Upper and lower and Middle Dischoure in Stirlingshire from John, lord Drummond, while in 1495 and 1496, he gained certain portions of land from Robert, lord Crichton of Sanquhar and William, lord Graham by investing in their debts owed to the crown.[317] In april 1510, Forrester converted his lease of the lands of Torwood in the lordship of Stilringshire into a feu holding.[318] Thus by 16 May 1508, when James IV issued a royal confirmation of his landed extent to his son Walter, Forrester had become a substantial landowner in Perthshire and Stirlingshire.[319] Duncan Forrester, whose periods of comptroller were marked by their surpluses and lack of interference by the treasurer, was obviously a man of considerable commercial and financial skill.

In many ways the rise in fortune of James Redheuch, comptroller from 1 May 1505 to 31 August 1508 and from 8 October 1512 to 23 September 1513, was similar to that of Duncan Forrester.[320] Originally a burgess from Stirling, Redheuch was active in crown service during the reigns of James III and IV for, apart from holding the office of comptroller, he

---

316. RMS, ii, 2261, 2297. Concerning the lands of Skipinch, in 1502 Duncan Forrester granted them to Archibald, earl of Argyll in exchange for 10 marks (old extent) of the land in Menteith. RMS, ii, 2669, 2670.

317. RMS. ii, 2288, 2308.

318. RMS, ii, 1802, 3447. ER, xiii, 642.

319. RMS, ii, 3228. By this charter the lands were united into the free barony of Garden-Forrester, which was held of the king in blanchfarm

320. Appendix A/1(b) List of Comptrollers.

had been appointed custumar of Stirling in 1473, Chamberlain of Strathearn in 1483 and of Menteith in 1485, and Steward of the household of Prince James and later as king.[321] The landed estate of Redheuch expanded in two ways, firstly from 1500 until 1513, James Redheuch was actively engaged in the purchase of land and six such charters are recorded in the Register of the Great Seal.[322] In April 1513, the effect of these various land transactions was seen in a royal confirmation granted to James Redheuch of Tullichedill of all his landed wealth which was united into the free barony of Tullichedill.[328] Secondly Redheuch invested a considerable sum of money in crown leases, for, in the period 1502 to 1507, he submitted an annual farm of £74-1-8 and 15 chalders of victuals to the crown for the lease of lands within the earldoms of Strathearn and Menteith and also in the lordship of Dirlton, in ward to the king at this time.[324] In addition, James Redheuch was granted a gift of the non-entry of the lands of Strogeith in Strathearn in February 1505-6 and two years later was conceded the escheated goods of Alexander Rogy, a chaplain who had died a bastard.[325]

Both these men originally of burgess stock, rose, during the reign of James IV, to the ranks of the gentry with a landed basis in both Stirlingshire and Perthshire. Such a alteration in social status required both royal favour and considerable capital and it would appear that both were achieved through royal service. Although Redheuch was active in crown service and investing in crown leases before he assumed the office of comptroller, the prosperity of Duncan Forrester appears to have coincided with his tenure of office as the king's comptroller. The fact

---

321. ER, viii, 248, ix, 252, 409, 483.

322. RMS, ii, 2666, 2688, 2726, 3372, 3485, 3498. Appendix B/8 (i)

323. RMS, ii, 3829.

324. Appendix B/8 (i)

325. RSS, i, 1223, 1603.

that many comptrollers and former holders of the office invested in royal leases suggests that they were empolyed by the crown as a further means of repayment these officials for their financial losses. In the 1450's the lands of the Halls of Rossy in Fife were feued to William Bonar as comptroller.[326] On 21 July 1490, £40 of the lordship of Strathbrau was let jointly to George, bishop of Dunkeld and Alexander Inglis, a former comptroller, for a period of 5 years with the privilege of subletting and freedom from the courts of both the chamberlain and the baillie. In addition, of the grassum, settled at £40, £20 was submitted to the present comptroller, Thomas Forest and the remaining £20 allowed to Alexander Inglis for the superexpenses in the office of comptroller.[327] Between 1 May 1499 and 17 November 1500, comptrollers sir Patrich Hume of Polworth and sir Robert Lundy of Galgasny, were joint feuars of the lands of Strathbrau, Auchinvaid and Gleenshee, each submitting an annual farm of £52-6-8.[328]

Throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the accounts of the comptroller were involved in a continual struggle to achieve a favourable balance, which more often than not was unsuccessful. However, the result was dependent on the operation of two factors, on the one hand the efficient and regular collection of crown revenue from the local fiscal officers, and on the other the comptroller's ability to restrict the expenses and costs of the royal household. In the former case, the success of the comptroller relied largely on his ability to extract the maximum from the local custumars, burgh baillies and the 'Ballivi ad Extra'

---

326. ER, v, 254, 370, 418.

327. ER, x, 706. Alexander Inglis last held the office of comptroller sometime around 31 May 1489. TA, i, 112.

328. RMS, ii, 2488-9. On 17 November 1500 the feu was taken over by John, lord Drummond and William, lord Ruthven. RMS, ii, 2555. Hume was comptroller from 9 November 1448 to March 1499-1500 while Lundy was appointed on 31 March 1499-1500 until his death before 28 February 1500-1. ER, xi, 250, 275, 276, 339-40, 367. The latter was also treasurer between 1497 and 1501.

but against that the comptroller's income was being constantly eaten away by inefficiency, corruption and frequent interference by various sectors of society. Concerning the latter factor, the efforts of the comptoller to balance his account were also being frustrated by the increase in the expenses of the king's household. As mentioned above, the cost of provisioning the household and sustaining the fees and expenses of its servants rose dramatically during the latter half of the reign of James IV. Unfortunately this was an area over which the comptroller exercised the least control and retrenchment was always subject to the will of the king.

It must be stated that both the charge and surcharge sides of the comptroller's accounts were somewhat misleading. For instance, an allowance in the comptroller's discharge should not be equated with payment. Since the Auditors of the Exchequer were not always able to determine if payment had actually been completed, frequently claimants were forced to take judicial action to pursue their right. This situation affected not only the fees payable to household officers but also sums entered in the household books. On the 6 February 1499-1500, the lords of the Council ordained that Hugh Martin, a former comptroller, was to pay sir Baldred Blackadder the 20 marks owed to him for his fee as marshall of the Household, which sum had incidently been allowed in the accounts of 1492.[329] Concerning the supplying of the king's household, there were frequent claims by a variety of persons against the comptroller for the non payment of their bills. The comptroller's inability to pay the full amount of his allowance was probably the result of his lack of ready cash and a certain priority of payments was undoubtedly observed. Thus, on the 25 October 1488, William Cathkin successfully sued George Robinson for the price of wine received by Robinson when he held the office of comptroller and which had been entered in the household books.[330] On the

---

329. ADC, ii, 379. ER, x, 376.
330. ADC, i, 97.

25 February 1501-2 the lords of the Council ordered George Robinson, the son of the late comptroller, to pay Elizabeth Bothwell, widow of Thomas Stanly, burgess of Edinburgh, £12 for wine received by the comptroller on behalf of James III for which the comptroller had received an allowance [331] while 12 days later, sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch was also ordered to pay for the two 'punsions' of claret bought from Andrew Wood of Largo.[332] The judicial records revealed two claims by the widow of Alexander Gryme, 'caterer to the king', firstly on the 16 September 1502 for payment of £34 from sir Duncan Forrester, comptroller, of which the lords of the Council ordered the latter to pay the pursuer £30-4/- as allowed in the Exchequer Rolls,[333] and secondly on the 31 January 1502-3, for £17-8/- spent by Alexander Gryme and not repaid by comptroller James Douglas of Pittendreich.[334] In January 1499-1500, Catherine Murray and Ann Glass claimed 13 crowns and £3-10/- from sir Duncan Forrester for the lodgings and expenses of Richard, Duke of York and on 15 July 1514, James Douglas also claimed £45 'for expensis maid be him apon Richard Plantagena, duk of York, utherwais callit the Quhite Ros and on his servandis with thare horsis being lugeit with the said James in his lugeing in Edinburgh at the command of our soverane lord'.[335] Many other similar clains were being made against the king's comptrollers for outstanding bills, which although discharged in the actual account, were still unsettled.

---

331. ADC, (Stair Society,), 529.

332. ADC, (Stair Society), 646.

333. ADC, (Stain Society), 720.

334. ADC, xii, f, 73.

335. ADC, ii, 361. ADC, xxvi, f 146. Miscellany of Scot.Hist.Soc., ix, 79, 81.

There were frequent complaints against the abuse of purveyance in fourteenth and fifteenth century England, especially during periods of crisis, Although no similar complaints were registered in the Scottish Parliament, it is possible that these 'judicial cases represented attempts by royal suppliers the detrimental effects of royal purveyance, that is, to extract full payment for supplies and provisions sent to the king's household. In an era when the comptroller found it extremely difficult to make ends meet, the temptation to resort to a form of purveyance may have presented itself and victims were forced to seek recompense in the courts.

A similar situation existed in the comptroller's charge, for, although he accepted responsibility for the sums entered in his charge, it was by no measn certain that he had actually received the money involved. When the comptroller assumed responsibility for the receipt entered in his charges he also accepted the risk of the local accountant defaulting in his payment. In order to clear his account, the comptroller frequently accepted a bond or obligation from the local 'receiver'. Not unnaturally, much of the comptroller's time was spent pursuing defaulters in the courts in order to ensure that actual payment was made. In an attempt to reduce the effect of inefficiency, corruption and even open stealing on the revenue charged to the comptroller, the latter was forced to continually supervise the activities of his local officials.

Between March 1497-8 and December 1505 John Leslie of Wardris, the son of Alexander Leslie pursued an action against John Dempster of Auchterless for the illegal withholding of £37-9-4 of the farms of Brechin from Alexander Leslie, comptroller of James III, under the terms of his obligation dated August 1481.[336] Frequently such cases remained unsettled for many years, sometimes long after the death of either or both of the

---

336. ADC, ii, 153. ADC, xvii, F 99. At the latter action, as well as the original £37-9-4 an additional £28-4-9 was claimed by John Leslie from the same source.

original participants. Also in 1497-8 John Leslie of Wardris pursued another action against James Douglas of Pittendreich, fromerly chamberlain of Moray, for the non payment of £73-8-11 and a quantity of wheat and bere as quoted in his letters of obligation.[337] On 1 December 1505 the comptroller, James Redheuch, accused Alexander Innes of that ilk of withholding £42-15/- the grassum for the lease of lands in the earldom of Moray and 2 lasts, 4 barrels of salmon from the fishing of the Spey, but the latter asserted he had already paid the amount quoted to the chamberlain of Moray and he was assigned the 14 January to prove his assertion or be put to the horn and his goods be escheat to the crown.[338] This example fully demonstrated one of the main difficulties of the comptroller for when both the tenant and the local 'Ballivi ad Extra' disclaimed responsibility for the payment of the sums due, it was a far from simple task for the comptroller to pin either party down. On 18 September 1508, Andrew Wood of Largo was decreed to pay the sum of £60 to sir Duncan Forrester, comptroller, under the terms of a bond which he shared with the earl of Argyll 'jointly and severalis' for the payment of one years rent for the lands of Mull and Murwarne, and failing payment the king ordered distraint.[339]

Persistent refusal to honour bonds and obligations was a continual headache to the comptroller. Normally the goods of the defaulters were ordered to be distrained so that the loss could be recovered. However, other measures were also invoked. In 1496 William, lord Graham became a crown debtor for £240 as the rest of a larger sum for the ward and marriage of the laird of Balmuto, as detailed by his letter of obligation and which sum the king had assigned to sir Duncan Forrester as part payments of the expenses of the king on his passage to the Isles.

---

337. ADC, ii, 102.

338. ADC, xvii, f 60.

339. ADC, xx, f 356.

Letters were sent to the sheriff of Stirling stating that, since lord Graham claimed to have no distrainable goods, the sheriff was to apprise 18 marks of land belonging to lord Graham which were to be conceded to sir Duncan Forrester in order to recover his loss.[340] On the 7 September 1503, Alexander, lord Hume was bound to pay sir John Stirling, comptroller, the sum of £154 between now and next Martinmas 'undir the pain of dowbilling of the sammyn to the king .... because the sais comptrollare tuke the sammyn apoun his as payment of the sail Alexanderis rest of his compt of the Forest'.[341] On 5 September 1517 the lords of the Council decreed that William Murray was to lose his feu of the lands Corremukloch and Glencharney in the earldom of Strathearn since Murray had failed to pay his feu duty quoted at £22 annually, or make any reckoning for the last four or five years.[342] In order to enfore the crown's rights to the fullest return from its patrimony and so that the employment of bonds as a means of delaying the actual payment of cash might not develop merely into a means of avoiding payment, the comptroller became involved in a series of judicial suits. Thus both the charge and the discharge side of the comptroller's account are misleading since the actual cash collected was undoubtedly much smaller at the time of the account. The use of bonds, corruption, the failure to made actual payment at the appropriate time frequently meant that the comptroller did not possess sufficient ready cash to meet the demands of the royal household and was himself forced to issue bonds to suppliers.

Although the comptroller was frequently compelled to resort to judicial proceedings in order to extract outstanding sums of money from reluctant local accountants, it seems that it was equally difficult to

---

340. RMS, ii, 2308. TA, i, 209, 221. The original composition was with with the countess of Angus for the sum of £373-6-8 of which the comptroller was assigned 300 marks.
341. ADC, xiv, f 186.
342. ADC, xxx, f 159.

prise overdue cash from the comptroller himself. The prevalence of such occurrances was limited by the fact that most central fiscal officials finished up with a deficit, but comptroller George Robinson left a surplus of at least £408-17-8, 10 chalders, 10 bolls of wheat, 20 chalders, 9 bolls of bere, 2 lasts, 3 barrels of salmon. However, it would appear that he had retained this surplus in his own possession for, on 24 January 1504-5, his son George was decreed to repay the outstanding debt.[343]

When the crown was unable to achieve a favourable balance between its income and its expenditure it was forced to borrow in order to make up the difference, The borrowing of James I and II seems to have involved a personal transaction between the king and his creditor, but, with the development of the office of comptroller from the mid fifteenth century, the latter assumed responsibility for most of the royal debts. Information concerning the nature and extent of crown borrowing is sadly lacking, and, apart from occasional entries in the comptroller's charge, nearly all the references to loans in the Exchequer accounts related to payments. Were loans to the crown extorted from unwilling subjects or was there sufficient incentive to produce voluntary loans from the king's subjects.
K.B. MacFarlane has demonstrated that in Lancastrian England, the crown did not need to extort loans by force since the lure of potential profit was sufficient to supply a steady flow of money.[344] His arguement is bound up with the question of usury, since, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, despite the fulminations of canon law, concealed interest was a common practice. The device was by necessity simple in form, leaving no trace in the official records and yet, at the same time, so committing the king to the repayment of the loan that the creditors were insured against default.[345] MacFarlane continues that 'the best and the only possible answer is that each lender was as a matter of course credited at the

---

343. ADC, xvi, f 28.
344. MacFarlane, 'Loans to Lancastrian Kings,' Cambridge Historical Journal, ix, 61.
345. Ibid, ix, 67.

Exchequer with a larger amount than he was actually prepared to advance. In effect, the sum recorded for the repayment of a royal debt in an accountant's discharge was in reality a combination of the original sum advanced to the king and the interest attached to it. Not unnaturally, surviving Mediaeval financial accounts did not record the intricacies of such transactions and so it is extremely difficult to assess the exact nature and extend of such contrivances.[346] It is probable that such arrangements were also in operation in Scotland.

As mentioned above, the Scottish crown in the fifteenth century relied heavily on the mercantile community for financial support. Loans to the king were forthcoming both from the entire burgh community and from individual burgesses. Between 1 February 1456-7 and 25 July 1457 Andrew Crawford, burgess of Edinburgh, travelled to Flanders to raise money on the security of the burghs for a tax and on the security of individual burgesses for a loan. On the former count, Crawford raised a total of £100-18/- in Flemish coin and £98-7-6 Scots, while from the individual burgess he managed to glean a total of £92-16-8 in Flemish coin. Apart from the costs of the embassy to France, the vast majority of the cash was spent in the purchase of munitions and drugs. A significant feature of the account was the heavy reliance on Edinburgh, for the community contributed £50 Flemish groats to the tax, and of the ninty three burgesses who lent money to the crown, eighty five were from Edinburgh.[347] Throughout the fifteenth century the Edinburgh customs accounts were employed to bolster royal finances, while Alexander Napier, William Bully and other powerful merchants were frequently involved in royal fiscal arrangements. The loans actually mentioned in the financial account must only have been the tip of the iceberg since many lenders

---

346. In England, these arrangements were called 'chevance', a means of evading the usury laws.

347. ER, vi, 305-11.

received repayment in a variety of methods which were not necessarily recorded in the Exchequer Rolls. Apart from direct cash repayments of a loan, crown gifts, Licences to export goods free of all customs duties and both temporary and permanent gifts of land were often the means by which all or part of a loan might be repaid. In 1482 Walter Bertram and George Robinson, burgesses of Edinburgh, were granted life pensions of £40 and £20 annually respectively which was probably a form of repayment of royal debts.[348] In the reign of James IV, the dramatic increase in allowances for the free export of goods by merchants and other persons suggested that this was becoming a favourite form a repayment. Between 1500 and 1513, remissions of custom duty to Robert Barton, a merchant from Leith, who was frequently engaged in commercial transactions on the king's behalf, amounted to £752.[349] Because the information concerning these financial transactions is limited, the exact scope of crown borrowing from the mercantile community must remain obscure.

---

348. ER, ix, 219, 221.

349. ER, xi, 273, 378, xii, 91, 164, 263, 373, 466, 594, xiii, 93, 98, 230, 365, 393, 487, 575.

THE ACCOUNTS OF THE TREASURER: DISCHARGE

In contrast to the expenditure of the comptroller, the discharge side of the treasurers' accounts was recorded in considerable detail. Although such a proliferation of evidence is a welcome situation, nevertheless, on account of the minuteness of the detail and its inherent repetitiveness, it is practical only to outline the various types of expenses their relation to the king's financial position.[1] However, any analysis of the treasurer's expenditure can be frustrating business, firstly because there was no certainty of classification, for instance, between June 1494 and November 1495 artillery expenses formed a separate heading, but between the latter date and January 1496-7 these expenses were included in the section entitled the 'Bursa Regis'.[2] However, the situation became more settled after 1502. Secondly, it was common to accumulate several important items of expenditure under a single heading, for instance, the 'Bursa Regis' frequently included large sums of money spent on building, shipping, diplomatic missions, artillery, the supply of drugs and a variety of other expenses too numerous to mention. Such irregularities in the accounting mechanism tended to distort any assessment of the value of individual units of expenditure, but an attempt has been made to extract the most important items and to evaluate their individual contributions. Within the various divisions of expenditure, the entries were recorded roughly in chronological order of allowance, and, in most cases, totals were entered at the foot of each division.

The sums disbursed by the treasurer do not seem to have been restricted to any limitation, although they were subject to the extent of the treasurer's receipts. Although many of the items of expenditure were

---

1. A comprehensive resume of the various items is contained in the introduction to Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, i - iv.

2. TA, i, 255, 273-311.

recorded as single entries, stating the date of payment, the commodity purchased and sometimes from whom it was bought, several entries in the treasurer's discharge seem to have been copies directly from original bills, accounts or 'petty comptis'. The treasurer was frequently allowed sums of money payable to cordiners, saddlers, tailors, armourers, and other tradesmen accourding to the details in their own accounts. These men were contracted by the crown for lengthy period and paid periodically by the treasurer for the goods purchased by them and also for their specialized labour. On 12 September 1503, John Lethame, saddler, was paid for 'gere tane to the king quhen he departit of Edinburgh; - for xiiji girthis, tua ourelaris, i paid double sterap ledderis, quhilk were covirit with satin crammesy, tagging, ringyng, bukkylling, and mending of brokin sadilles, stopping of sadilles, hopschakilles, girthes for the harnes hors, mending of coffir sadilles and brases to thaim, as his compt beris, of sindri prices'.[4] Although the treasurer seems to have made his payments according to these bills, the latter were, however, checked. In 1474 when £20-19-11 was paid to Archibald Edmonstone for expenses in the king's stables after the tenor of his bill of expenses 'particulary examinat at the Chekkare'.[5] These bills were submitted to the treasurer for a particular length of time and usually at the termination of the period. On 13 September 1503, James Linton, cordiner, was paid £9-18-8 for boots, shoes and other footware sent to the king between 24 February and 24 August.[6] However, allowances of a more definate type tended to be made in advance. In November 1506, Master James Watson received his montly allowance for the next three months, at 8/- per day, for the expenses of the bairns.[7]

---

3. TA, iv, 261.
4. TA, ii, 219.
5. TA, i, 66.
6. TA, ii, 219. The previous payment covered the period from 24 August 1502 until 24 February 1503 and so there was continuity of payment.
7. TA, iii, 352.

The treasurer seems to have delegated some of his duties to subordinates who made payments on his behalf. In 1512, sir James Kincraigie dean of Aberdeen, received a special royal licence to alienate and sell the lands of Belhelvie in the barony of Ballinbreich 'for the outred and payment of certaine soumex of monye for the quhilkis he standis dettour to divers merchandice takin be him to the kingis use fra thaim the tyme he wes thesaurare clerk, and for the outred theirof the kingis heinis infeft him in the saidis landis, park and fisching, efter thai wer recognist and appreciate to the kingis use'.[8] The treasurer frequently made personal contributions to the king's purse (cash for the king's personal use), but on occasions when the treasurer did not accompany the king, others were employed to convey the cash to the king. On 1 July 1501, when the king travelled to Thrieve, Patrick Sinclair was given 40 French crowns (£28) 'to furnis the Kingis purs'.[9] As with other late Medieaval accounts, the mere appearance of an entry in the discharge did not presuppose actual payment, but merely that the treasurer had sought and received an allowance for a particular sum of money.

The cost of provisioning the royal wardrobe was a regular item in the treausurer's discharge. It was normal to have separate accounts for the king, the queen, the prince, and other selected persons, connected with the royal house.[10] Concerning the latter, in 1474 the treasurer expended £82 on the wardrobe of the king's sister resident in Haddington, between June 1488 and May 1490, just over £600 was spent in similar fashion on the duke of Ross, the earl of Mar and lady Margaret, all members of the royal house, and finally, between February 1500-1 and the

---

8. RSS, i, 2403.

9. TA, ii, 113.

10. Except in the accounts ending February 1504-5 and August 1506, when the wardrobe accounts of the king and queen were united.

same month 1504-5, a total of £700 was spent on clothing for Margaret Drummond and her daughter by the king.[11] From the surviving accounts, it is apparent that James IV expended more cash on the provisioning of the royal wardrobe than his father. Between August 1473 and December 1474, a total of £1,607-11-4 was allowed to the treasurer for the royal wardrobe, while the latter years of James IV recorded expenses of £3,673 for the year 1506-7, £2,048 for 1507-8, £2,398 for 1511 but only £565 for 1512-3.[12] Such expenses were always more excessive after the king's marriage when the upkeep of the queen's wardrobe was also included. During the reign of James IV there was an overall increase in the expenditure associated with the royal wardrobe and there is a corresponding increase in the rate of spending on the king's personal attire. The average annual outlay on the king's own wardrobe amounted to £489 in the mid 1470's, £902 between 1488 and 1492, £1,739 between February 1505 and August 1508, while in the year ending August 1512 £1,341 was disbursed by the treasurer in this manner.[13] The account of the queen's personal wardrobe was normally separate from that of the king, but in the account of treasurer James Beaton, abbot of Dunfermline between February 1504-5 and August 1506, the two accounts were mixed together in a single entry.[14] From the single account for the reign of James III, it would appear that Queen Margarer's average annual wardrobe expenditure amounted to £569, while between 1506 and 1508, Margaret Tudor's annual expenses totalled £664 and rose to £1,037 in the year ending August 1512.[15] Although wardrobe expenses did not fluctuate violently, between September 1502 and

---

11. TA, i, 72-3, 152-163, ii, 39-47, 294.8. The duke of Ross and earl of Mar were brothers of James IV. Lady Margaret was the second daughter of James II.
12. See Appendix No.
13. See Appendix No. The fall in the level of spending on the king's wardrobe in the final years of the reign could, in fact be attributed to the diversion of funds to other, more pressing sources.
14. TA, iii, 34-54.
15. See Appendix No.

February 1504-5, a total of £10,560 was recorded for supplying the wardrobe of James IV and his Queen, Margaret Tudor. A substantial portion of this figure included the cost of providing for the king's wardrobe in preparation for his wedding. For the occasion it appears that James IV required a completely new wardrobe with gowns, coats and doublets made from the most expensive materials. In July 1503, for instance, two gowns made from expensive cloth of gold (at between £28 and £32 an ell) and lined with 'fyne buge skinnis' and 'mertrik skinnis' plus a large and small mentle of 'mertrik' were made for the king at a total cost of £1,444.[16] In addition a coat of damask adorned with gold wire, costing £19 an ell, was made for the king at a total expense of £237.[17] As well as clothing other items were recorded in the same section in connection with the royal marriage, £76 was allowed to the treasurer for the various coins delivered to John Currour, goldsmith, to be melted and made into a crown for the queen, a further £20 'for making and werkmanschip and inlayk of the samyn'. £122 was paid to Robert Barton for the cost of purchasing a 'gret broun hors' and bringing it to Scotland.[18] After the wedding, considerable cash was spent on furnishing the queen's chamber, £390 for cloth of gold to adorn the queen's bed of state, £371 for velvet for hangings for the chamber, and £166 for hangings fo scarlet cloth to be placed in the queen's closet.[19] However, such lavish expense on clothing and other wardrobe supplies was exceptional. The 1488-90 account gave a detailed breakdown of the scale and priorities of such spending. In these, the first two years of the reign of James IV, the treasurer sustained the cost of

---

16. TA, ii, 208. 'Buge' was lambskin which seems to have been specially dressed, and 'mertrix' the fur of the marten.

17. TA, ii, 208.

18. TA, ii, 206.

19. TA, ii, 213.

purchasing material for gowns at £1,425, doublets at £215, jackets at £73, bonnets at £50, saddles at £80, hose at £129, Holland cloth for shirts and napkins at £20 and sheets at £38.[20] The king's wardrobe was being constantly replenished, for, between 14 February 1500-1 and 9 September 1502, the treasurer was allowed a total of £2,058 for the supply of four coats, 4 'meit-coats', two riding coats, six gowns, four cloaks, seven doublets and three jackets, along with the usual provision of hose, hats, bonnets, boots, sheets and other smaller items.[21] As well as clothing, the wardrobe accounts recorded the cost of cutlery, horses, jewelry, swords, daggers, drugs, books and various furnishings for the king's chamber. Such miscellaneous items were frequently expensive. In 1501 the treasurer paid almost £40 for the purchase of nine stuffed feather beds from Flanders and during the entire nineteen months of the account.[22] The expenses of the King's wardrobe included not only the purchase of materials but also the cost of labour and occassionally transportation.[23] On 4 September 1502, £20 was submitted to Martin Bailie for his services shoeing the king's horses for the next twelve months.[24]

The cost of clothign varied according to the quality and price of the material employed. Between 23 and 28 January 1502-3, the treasurer accounted for the cost of two gowns, the first of valvet at £2.an ell, lined with polecat fur, at £4 a mantle, amounting to £73, and the second made from the same quantity of blue damask, at 24/- an ell, lined with fine lambskin costing only £42.[25] Not unnaturally, the cost of a particular article of clothing varied according to the material employed. However, even within a given year the price of cloths and silks tended to fluctuate considerably, for between February 1500-1 and September 1502 the price of

---

20. TA, i, 135-151.
21. TA, ii, 39.
22. TA, ii, 20-39.
23. TA, ii, 34, 35.
24. TA, ii, 39.
25. TA, ii, 200.

Holland cloth varied from 4/- to 7/- an ell, satin from 18/- to 28/6, velvet from 23/- to 40/-, Breton cloth from 1/8 to 2/3 and silk from 3/- to 3/6.[26] The underlying reasons behind such price variations were various and difficult to pin down, but quality and the market conditions must have had decisive influences. Concerning the former, in 1512 the price of ordinary crimson satin stood at £3-10/- and ell whereas a finer version of the same commodity was purchased at £6 an ell. The expense of dyeing material obviously affected the price. In the same year, white kersey from England was priced at 10/- an ell while dyed scarlet, the same cloth cost 22/- an ell.[27] The price of satin varied from 24/- to 50/- an ell, crimson satin from 70/- to 100/-, but when brocaded with gold thread, it was sold for 110/-. Such variations made any assessment of long term price alterations extremely difficult but it would appear that during the reign of James III and IV the cost of most materials did not alter drastically. In 1474 the price of fustian ranged from 2/6 to 3/- an ell and in 1512 the same prices were in operation and similarly the cost of satin between these dates seems to have remained steady at between 26/- and 40/- an ell. The absence of any native textile industry forced the Scottish monarchy to import the vast majority of clothing matetial, except for the coarsest cloth. During the reign of James IV substantial quantities of more refined cloth was imported from England and Flanders. However, in common with other monarchies of north western Europe there was a growing demand for luxury items from the east for which payment was often made in bullion. Silks, damasks, velvet, cotton and other materials manufactured in northern Italy were frequently purchased for northern courts. Although Scotland was actively engaged in this trade, the limited resources of the Scottish crown must have restricted the quantity purchased. Only for the wedding of James IV is there evidence of the large scale purchasing of luxurious and

---

26. TA, ii, 20-39.

27. TA, iv, 191-207.

expensive materials like cloth of gold at between £28 and £32 en ell, damask adorned with gold wire at £19 and damask 'flourit with gold' at £4-15/-. Although satins and velvet were normal purchases for the Scottish crown, on this occasion a higher quality than usual was acquired. The normal quality of velvet bought by the crown was valued at around 40/- to 45/- an ell, but in 1503 the purchase of crimson velvet at £8-10/- and purple velvet at £4-10/- an ell were recorded in the treasurer's discharge while expensive polecat fur at between £4 and £5 a mantle was also obtained.[28]

The king's alms and offerings formed a not inconsiderable part of the treasurer's discharge. Included under this heading were alter offerings, payments for masses, gifts to religious houses and charitable gifts.[29] A portion of these payments were made through the king's almoner, sir Andrew Macbrek, who received from the treasurer the regular total of £3 a week with other miscellaneous sums which he was bound to distribute.[30] At Easter around twenty nine or thirty 'pur men' received gifts of clothing shoes and cash, amounting in 1501 to £62.[31] The bulk of these gifts were directed towards the church, in the shape of offerings at the alter or to a light, usually between 9/- and 14/- , offerings at high mass at 12/- during the reign of James III but raised to between 14/- and 18/- by his son, £1 for a trental of masses, and, it was normal to make an offering of between 14/- to £14 to the first mass of a priest after ordination.[32] Gifts to religious bodies were normally small in amount although frequent in occurrance. Certain religious houses seem to have been especially favoured

---

28. TA, ii, 208-9, 213. A mantle appears to have amounted to two distinct sizes, one of 30 skins and the other of 60. For further details of imported materials and the manner of dress used by royalty in the fifteenth century, see TA, i, clviii-clxxxvii.
29. TA, i, ccxxix-ccxxxii.
30. TA, i, 229, iv, 70.
31. TA, ii, 71.
32. TA, ii, 69-81, i, 71-2.

for between February 1500-1 and September 1502 the friars of Stirling received a total donation of over £146.[33] In addition, James IV spent large sums of money on the furnishing of the Chapel Royal in Stirling, which was completed by 1500. Between February 1500-1 and August 1506, a total of £2,221 was expended by the treasurer on vestments, plate and the chaplains' fees.[34] By far the largest single item of expenditure in this connection was the purchase of bells for the collegiate church in 1502. They were bought in England by David Menzies, burgess of Aberdeen, at a cost of £728-6-8 and a further £29-3-4 was required to pay an English carpenter to hang them.[35] Much has been said of James IV's religious observance and zeal,[36] and although he was never reluctant to exploit the resources of the church for his own use; nevertheless he did expend considerable sums of money on alms, furnishings and gifts to ecclesiastical establishments and organizations. After 1500 there was an obvious increase in such expenditure. During the period from August 1473 to December 1474, a total of £89 was expended in alms but between 1502 and 1508 the average annual bill amounted to £1,075 and in the year ending August 1512, £941 was spent in this manner.[37]

Fees, pensions and wages formed a regular and substantial part of the treasurer's discharge. Termed as 'ordinar' or 'ordinaries', expenditure on pensions, fees and wages consisted of fixed sums payable at regular intervals, usually based on the authority of a commission or a letter of gift issued under the privy seal.[38] Some pensions were paid directly out

---

33. TA, ii, 71-81.
34. TA, ii, 61-9, 288-94, iii 77-81. The Chapel Royal was also well endowed with royal property in 1506, it received a royal grant of lands of Castle-law in Edinburgh, Auchinvad, Strathbran and Glenshee in Perth valued at £184-13-4. RMS, ii, 3002.
35. TA, ii, 67-8, 288.
36. Mackie, King James IV of Scotland, 153. Donaldson, Scottish Kings, 127.
37. See Appendix No.
38. RSS, i, 348, 591, 606, 666, 849, 1555.

of the casualty receipts while others were submitted from the king's coffers, but no distinction was made in the actual accounts. In 1500 Master William Dunbar was granted a pension of £10 annually under a privy seal letter 'to be pait to him of soverane lordis cofferis, be the thesaurare'.[39] On certain occasions, the king's precept seems to have been sufficient to authorize such payments.[40] However, once authorised it was normal for such fees and pensions to continue to be allowed in the treasurers' accounts until a contrary mandate was issued by the king or auditors or until the recipient had died.

The recipients of fees, pensions, payments by royal precept and rewards were mostly royal servants or employees outside the immediate household circle (to whom payment was normally forthcoming from the accounts of the comptroller), or those who had performed some particular service to the crown. Among the royal servants in receipt of an annual annuity were Master James Henrieson, the king's advocate (£40), Walter Merlion, master mason (£40), Nannik Derikson, embrioderer (20 marks), Dougal Hannay, falconer (£20) and sir John Sharp, keeper of the royal gardens at the Palace of Holyrood (10 marks).[41] In the account of 1474, many of the entries under the heading of pensions were, in fact, payments of recompence for certain services rendered to the crown; £14-10/- to Thomas Bowar, 'for the makin of certaine speris and ledin mellis, and uthir stuf pertenyng to the makin of theim,' and £3 to the men of North Berwick 'that fand the Kingis ankeris and cabillis of his kervell'.[42]

Towards the end of the reign of James IV, an increasing number of foreigners were in receipt of annuities from the treasurer. These entries

---

39. RSS, i, 563, TA, ii, 92, 95, 335.
40. TA, i, 65-6, ii, 91-3.
41. RSS, i, 277, 348, 606. TA, iii, 117, 118, 120, 121, 125, 127, 327, 385, iv, 69, 70, 267, 268.
42. TA, i, 65-6.

were mostly to foreign craftsmen; £20 annually to Master Patrick Coventre, 'the lang Doctos of Denmark', £84 to Cressent, an Italian mason, £18-13-4 to Hans, a Danish gunner, £56 to Pasing, an armourer, and payment to Simon Nicholas, an Italian embroiderer, Wolf, the gunner and Gervais, a French gunner.[43] In the fields of military science, building, ship construction, music, arts and crafts, James was anxious to attract foreign masters so as to encourage the development of such activities in Scotland. For their services the king was forced to offer large annuities, for, in 1512-3, Cressent, the Italian mason, received for his expenses and fee £7 a month and Martin Buschard, carver, received £5-12/- monthly for himself and three French crowns for his servant.[44] Also in the same year, an unknown Spanish knight was paid a total of £54-2/- on various occasions before 24 June 1512.[45] Several pensions were paid out in foreign coin, namely the £10-10/- allowed to the Squire of Cleisch was disbursed in 15 light French crowns.[46] The cost of entertaining the court with foreign minstrals from Italy and France was often considerable. In the 1512 account, the combined expense of yule and summer livery, at £6-10/- each, and fees amounted to the sum of £415.[47] Peter and Francis de Luca, 'spelair' received a yearly pension of £50 in 1501.[48] In 1501 Andrew Stewart, son of the forfeited duke of Albany, received an annual annuity of £50.[49] Of the few educated persons in medieaval Scotland, most came from an ecclesiastical background and it was natural that they were frequently employed by the king for administrative duties. The additional

---

43. TA, ii, 94, 333, 335, iv, 117, 268, 271, 272, 276-7.
44. TA, iv, 271-2
45. TA, iv, 270.
46. TA, iv, 269.
47. TA, iv, 270-1.
48. TA, ii, 96.
49. TA, ii, 92.

attraction was that ecclesiastical servants could be recompensed by granting them the fruit of a benefice in lieu of an annual pension. However, there were not always benefices available, with the result temporary pensions were paid to these clerics by the treasurer until the situation improved. In 1510, Master Patrick Coventry and Master William Dunbar were granted pensions of £40 and £80 respectively, to endure until they could be provided with benefices valued at £100 each.[50] It would appear that several lay pensioners were in temporary receipt of annuities from the treasurer until a more permanent form of reward was available. In 1510 George Campbell of Cessnock received the grant of a pension of £40 to be paid by the treasurer 'and quhill he be rewardit be the king for his service'.[51] In 1498 Master James Henrieson the king's advocate was gifted a pension of £40 until provided with £40 worth of land, but since he was still in receipt of his pension in 1513, it would appear that the alternative provision had not yet been implemented.[52] Thus, it would seem that many pensions were intended to be of temporary duration, to supplement the inadequacies of more substantial and convenient forms of royal patronage.

The extent of the annuity received would obviously have depended on the importance of the service performed. In 1474 sir David Guthrie, the justiciar, received a fee of £100 while in 1512, both Henry, lord Sinclair, master of the artillery and sir Alexander McCulloch of Mireton, master falconer, each recorded similar fees of £100 annually.[53] Apart from fees paid to foreigners, the majority of pensions ranged from 10 marks to £50 annually. At the other end of the spectrum, in 1500 sir Robert Rankin received a year's fee of £3-10/- to remain at Darnaway,[54] and in 1508 'foure rokkons of the Princes' were allowed individual annual fees of £2-13-4.[55] The majority of fees and pensions were calculated annually.

---

50. RSS, i, 2079, 2119.
51. RSS, i, 2159.
52. RSS, i, 277. TA, iv, 444.
53. TA, i, 66, iv, 267. RSS, i, 2221.
54. TA, ii, 96. 55. TA, iv, 70.

In contrast, the king's chaplains were in receipt of their fee in £10 quarterly installments.[56] In 1511, Matthew Campbell, James Dog and Dandy Doule each took one light French crown weekly as their fees (amounting to £36-8/- a year), while in the same year, Robert, the cutler, was paid £1 for each dagger produced.[57] In general, pensions and fees tended to be calculated in years, half years or quarter years and wages in months and weeks. For instance, in 1506 John Merchiston, sailor, received 'his pension of the said terme at ' 20 marks; whereas Andrew Barton accepted £26 for the 'foure marinaris than kepic the schip in the poll of Erth' for the months of November, December and January, calculated at £2 each a week. In the same year an unknown painter received a wage of five crowns a month.[58] As with the fees allowed to the comptroller, those submitted by the treasurer seem to have been subjected to certain arbitrary increases. In 1511 James Stewart, son of the laird of Ardgowan received his usual pension of £40 for the two terms of Martinmas and Whitsun, but an extra £10 was forthcoming at the latter term.[59] Also in 1512 James Winchester, furrier to the king was in receipt of two separate annual fees of £40 and £10 from the treasurer.[60] Having been fixed at a specific rate, most annuities tended to remain static unless 'an augmentatione of his fee' was inserted in the treasurer's discharge,[61] or a fresh grant was issued under the privy seal. Concerning the latter, in 1506 Master William Dunbar was in receipt of a annual pension of £10, by the following year the level had been raised to £20 annually when it was stated to be 'new ekit' and finally on 26 August 1510 a new pension of £80 was issued to Dunbar under the privy seal.[62]

---

56. TA, ii, 94, iv, 269. Payments were made at Allhallow day, Candlemas and Lamas.
57. TA, iv, 269, 272.
58. TA ,iii, 326.
59. TA, iv, 268.
60. TA, iv, 268-9.
61. TA, iv, 269.
62. TA, iii, 118, 327, iv, 69, 268. RSS, i, 563, 2119.

Many of the pensions received in the treasurers' dicharge seem to have possessed no official designation for James Stewart of Traquair was in receipt of an annual annuity of £40 for no apparent reason.[63] However, recipients of royal fees and pensions were mostly those involved at court, either as royal servants, James Winchester, furrier or James Henryson, advocate, both at £40 annual pension,as a household official like sir James Inglis, clerk of the king's closet also at £40 yearly, or 'hangers on' whose identity is not always east to discover. Chaplains at the Chapel Royal received an annual pension of £40 whereas the chaplain who sang for the king at Cambuskenneth acquired an annuity of 20 marks.[64] From around 1500 there was an obvious inflation in the total cost of pensions payable from the accounts of the treasurer, partly the result of the high incentives offered to foreign craftsmen. Even fairly menial tasks were rewarded with large pensions, for, in 1511 William White, potter was granted an annual payment of £40 'for his labouris at the weschele of the kechingis and cunzehouse'.[65] Those connected with the preparations for the invasion of England in 1512 and early 1513, both native and foreign, received a high level of wage. Robert Borthwick, gunner and master melter of the king's guns, received for himself and his six servants a total of £253-4/- for nine months work, Gervais, a French gunner, received payments of £62-16/- for his services, George Kippingham, a smith in Edinburgh castle, was paid £84-14/- for eleven months work, and Wollof Urnebrig, 'that makis gun powder in the Castell of Edinburgh' accepted ten individual monthly payments of £4-4/-.[66]

---

63. TA, iv, 267.
64. TA, iv, 267-9.
65. TA, iv, 272.
66. TA, iv, 439, 440, 442. Robert Borthwick received £7-10/- a month for himself, and for five of his servants £4-4/- each a month and £2-2/- for the other. Most of these payments included the wages of the master and his servants.

Although the majority of fees and pensions were paid out for the terms included in duration of the particular account, it was not uncommon for such payments to be in arrears or indeed for them to be made in advance. In 1511 lord Sinclair, master of the artillery, received an extra £50 as 'the rest of the zeir precedand this compt of the Mertimas terme', while in the same account, sir Alexander McCulloch, master falconer, was allowed an additional 50 marks for the next term of Martinmas.[67] Inevitably the payment of fees, wages, pensions and annuities was affected by the extent of treasurer's receipts - although it may be said that allowance in the discharge did not necessarily ensure actual payment.

Under the terms of the marriage contract, Margaret Tudor was entitled to the provision of twenty four English attendants, and although there seems to have been some dispute as to who should sustain their expenses, James IV or Henry VII, the evidence is clear that the former was left to pay their saleries.[68] In the initial treasurer's account after the marriage, the salaries of twenty three servants were recorded, amounting to a total annual levy of £302-6-8 sterling or £1,058-3-4 Scots. The leading servants were in receipt of large pensions; sir Ralf Varnay, the chamberlain, received £175 annually (50 sterling), while the queen's treasurer, Edward Benestede, and lady Varney, the wife of the chamberlain, each received £116-13-4 annually (50 marks sterling).[69] Although these pensions helped to swell the total annuity allowance sought by the treasurer, they seem to have been a temporary burden, for by 1508 only nine were still in the accounts and by 1511, these payments were only made over to two servants at £37 yearly.[70]

---

67. TA, iv, 267.
68. Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland, iv, 336. TA, iii, xciv-cii, for details of the personnel incolcws.
69. TA, ii, 336-340.
70. TA, iv, 270.

Although many of the king's household officers received their fees and pensions from the comptroller's accounts, allowances for their livery clothing appeared in the discharge of the treasurers. Most of the household officials received supplies of gowns, especially 'the leveray agane Yule', doublets, hats, footwear, hose and various other items, the cost of purchase and manufacture being sustained by the treasurer. The type of material used varied according to the status of the recipient, for instance a livery gown for sir John Ramsey of velvet (at 44/- an ell) cost £39-12/- whereas the Yule livery gown of William Fockart, yeoman, of Rouen tan cloth (at 11/- an ell) cost only 55/-.[71] In 1511-2, a separate account was rendered of the livery granted to the ladies of the court,[72] which amounted to £1,203 for the entire year. For the majority of the household servants cheap cloth was employed in making their liveries; Rouen tan, fustian, and cloth from Lille, and even when satin or velvet was used, it was invariably of poorer quality than that supplied to the king. However, the clothing supplied for the wedding of James IV was of a higher standard and the total cost of providing the king's household servants with suitable attire amounted to £3,662. A higher quality of cloth was used, lord Hamilton received a gown of white damask 'flourit with gold' costing £76 while sir Alexander Bruce was provided with a gown of crimson velvet, valued at £80.[73] In addition, on 9 August 1503, the countess of Surrey received 15 ells of cloth of gold, at £22 an ell, 'quhen scho and hir dochtir Lady Gray clippit the Kingis berd' and the same Lady Gray received 15 ells of gold damask, at £12 an ell, which gifts cost a total of £510.[74] Such excessive extravagance is an excellent example of James's carefree and liberal attitude to the question of making ends meet and served only to augment the financial difficulties of his leading fiscal officials.

71. TA, iv, 248, 258.

72. TA, iv, 255-67.

73. TA, ii, 306. The damask cost £4-15/- an ell and the crimson velvet amounted to £5 an ell.

74. TA, ii, 314.

Some individuals benefitted greatly from this allowance. In the year following August 1511, sir James Hamilton received allowances for hose, a livery gown, a coat, two doublets, a bonnet, a saddle, sheets and a variety of footwear to the tune of £35-3-11.[75] Most of the recipients were attached to the king's service and even menial employees like Finlay the runner, the groom at the Falkland stable and various lacqueys were not ignored.[76] Persons under the royal wing were also in receipt of a livery allowance, royal wards lord Lyle and the constable of Dundee were listed in this category as were foreigners Martin the Spaniard and the French lacquey.[77]

The majority of household officials received their fees and livery allowance in the manner mentioned above. However, there were several exceptions. In 1511-2 William Wood, usher of the chamber, received a total of £34-12/- in addition to his livery allowances 'because he takkis na pensies of the Kingis Grace ... to furneise his necessaris and sxpens deliverit at divers tumez'.[78] Although Adam Cockburn received a livery allowance in 1508, in 1511 he received his normal annual pension of £40 and an additional £20 'takand for his clething'.[79]

Allowance for pensions and fees and also for liveries to household officers formed an increasing part of the treasurer's discharge during the reign of James IV, In 1473-4 expenses under these headings amounted to £819 but by 1494-5 they had risen to £2,136. The increase continued in the later years of James IV, in 1507 and 1508 the totals reached £3,212

---

75. TA, iv, 233-4.
76. TA, iv, 262.
77. TA, iv, 243, 245, 246, 263. Lord Lyle was one of the 'bairns' whose expenses were sustained by the kings, of which more later, while the lands of the Constabulary of Dundee in ward, were administered directly by the crown, the latter being responsible for the upkeep of the heir. TA, iv, 170.
78. TA, iv, 252.
79. TA, iv, 55, 63, 65, 269.

THE FINANCES OF THE SCOTTISH CROWN IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

CRAIG MADDEN

DEGREE OF PHD.
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.
1975
VOL III

and £2,747 respectively and by 1512, a total of £6,427 was spent on the fees, pensions, and liveries of the household servants of both the king and queen. In the first decade of the sixteenth century, the treasurer was responsible for the pensions of an increasing number of royal servants and officials,both foreign and native, a fact which goes a long way in explaining the increased expenditurein this section of his accounts. For instance between February 1500-1 and September 1502 thirty one pensioners were recorded in the account of the treasurer, whereas for the twelve months ending August 1512 no less than seventy three individuals claimed annuities of various types.[80]

With certain exceptions, most other items of expenditure sustained by the treasurer were alligned under the general title of 'Bursa Regis'. Expenditure under that heading was often fairly substantial, in 1506-7 a total of £8,584 was allowed to the treasurer and in 1511-2, £9,763 was spent.[81] In the accounts for the early part of James IV's reign, the 'Bursa Regis' tended to be extremely universal in character, but from around 1500, expenditure on building, shipping, justice ayres, foreign purchases and various other items were normally accounted for in individual sections with the dramatic rise in spending on public works, shipping and the provision of foreign merchandise, the greater subdivision of the treasurers' discharge represented a practical reform.

In order to gain full insight into the prinicpal items of expenditure, it has been found necessary to extract these entries from the main body of the 'Bursa Regis' - that is if they were not already entered as a separate item of expenditure - and to deal with the miscellaneous entries of the 'Bursa Regis' at the end.

---

80. TA, ii, 946, iv, 267-272.

81. TA, ii, 329-417, iv, 309-358.

Many of the goods purchased by the treasurer, especially after 1500, were obtained from agents or factors abroad. In north western Europe, a considerable portion of the financial and commercial arrangements during the fifteenth century tended to be dominated by Italians as in England where the London branch of the Medici bank played an extremely active role. Between 1503 and 1512, James IV seems to have employed Jerome Friscobaldi as his main agent in Flanders, not only for the purchase of foreign products but also for various other financial transactions conducted abroad by the crown. The use of foreign financiers and merchants to conduct the king's business abroad was not confined to James IV, for his great grandfather, James I, employed the services of Thomas Bernwell of London, Dominic Vaillanis of Florence and Lazarine and Pellegrine Grellus of Genoa.[82] On 2 May 1504 a total of £325-10-3 Scots was allowed to the treasurer for payment made to Julian, factor to Jerome Friscobaldi of Lombardy, in Flemish coin for the cost of purchasing 35 timbers of ermine and also the expense of making, decorating, packing and transporting five chairs of state.[83] Throughout the latter part of the reign of James IV, Friscobaldi received large sums of money from the treasurer for his services. In 1506-7 Friscobaldi entered an account for expenditure of £713-9-10 in Flemish groats (£1 of Flemish groats was equivalent at this time to £3 Scots) which he was recorded as having paid for a steik of cloth of gold, several illuminated books, 'a gret hors to the King', two dispensations for James Stewart and Master Laurence Taylor, the cost of sending the bulls of the deanery of Aberdeen to Dr. Babington, payment to Archbishop of St.Andrews 'for j^{m} ducatis finance maid in Venys' and finally Friscobaldi was allowed £12-17-6 in Flemish currency for an error of calculation in the conversion of coins from one currency to another.[84] In 1512 £608-13-4

---

82. ER, iv, 443, 444, 472, 480, 483, 507, 538, 542, 567, 570, 616, 621, 628.

83. TA, ii, 227-8.

84. TA, iii, 278-9. The error of calculation was in the conversion of 200 French crowns into Flemish groats, which was estimated by Friscobaldi at £49-3-4 in Flemish coin, but in reality, was valued at £62-0-10 in groats.

the tax contributionof the abbeys of Cuper, Kinloss and the priory of Pluscardine, was assigned to James Wright, a factor to Jerome Friscobaldi, in part payment of his expenses.[85] The sums allowed to Friscobaldi in the accounts of the treasurer included not only the cost of the article purchased or the business transacted but also a certain percentage extracted for his services.

However, James IV employed other persons to purchase goods for the king and his household from foreign markets. It seems that the treasurer supplied all or most of the cash in advance and the supplier was required to render an account of his purchases on his return. At the time of the marriage of James IV, the treasurer submitted a total £2,800 to master James Merchiston for merchandise bought by him in Flanders and shipped to Scotland.[86] It was not uncommon for suppliers to borrow from Scottish merchants in order to purchase merchandise and the latter were subsequently repaid by the treasurer. In 1507 John Francis borrowed 1,461 franks from various merchants of Edinburgh and £730, the equivalent in Scots currency, was reimbursed by the treasurer.[87] In 1505, 4404 French crowns, valued at £3,082 Scots, was given by Robert Barton to the coiner in Bruges and although no explanation was forthcoming, it was possibly repayment of a loan advanced either to James himself or to one of his factors conducting business on the king's behalf.[88] In 1506 £1,428-13-4 and a gold chain weighing eighteen ounces was sent to John Francis for exchange in London and subsequently delivered to Goerge Cornton 'for the quhet quhilk suld haf bene bocht' and for gold purchased in London for the painter.[89] Both in

---

85. TA, iv, 365.

86, TA, ii, 241-2

87. TA, iii, 279.

88. TA, iii, 244.

89. TA, iii, 55.

employment of precious metals to supplement the shortage of ready funds seems to have been a frequent expedient to ensure fairly prompt payment. In 1506 George Cornton was in receipt of £266-13-4 from the treasurer in order to redeem the earl of Huntly's chain containing sixty links and weighing over two pounds, eight ounces and which presumably been held as security for future payment by the crown.[90] Both in Endlgnad and the continent, the king employed various agents, both native and foreign to conduct his financial business. In addition, many home based merchants combined their own trading with the purchasing of supplies for the king. Craftsmen were also contracted to supply the king with the fruits of their trade, for in 1507, Downe a candlemaker received £100 to buy tallow.[91] However, special missions required separate arrangements. In February 1505-6, 1,11o gold angels and two chains weighing 66½ ounces (with a total value of £1,295 Scots), were delivered to the dean of Moray and sir Thomas Halkerstone for the purchasing of papal bulls for the see of St.Andrews and, in September, a further £107 was allowed to Robert Barton and Andrew Matheson to collect the bulls.[92]

Many of these contracts appeared, in the early years of James IV, in the 'Bursa Regis' section, but between 1502 and 1508, separate accounts were rendered in the treasurer's discharge. During those six years, a total of £16,934 was expended in the king's financial transactions abroad.[93]

Since the thirteenth century, the expense of public works was included in royal accounts.[94] During the early fifteenth century, local

---

90. TA, iii, 55.

91. TA, iii, 279.

92. TA, ii, 243.

93. See Appendix No.

94. ER, i, 40-1.

Ballivi ad Extra and customers tended to sustain the expense of constructing or repairing royal buildings. In 1424 the buildings around the 1302 peel at Linlithgow were burnt together with the church of St.Michael and under John Walton, Robert Wedale and Robert Livingstone in the 1450s, John Weir in the early 1450s and Henry Livingstone between March 1467-8 and October 1470, considerable reconstruction was achieved.[95] Apart from financial references, the masonry style of certain sections of Linlithgow Palace suggested that considerable work was done to rebuild the palace in the fifteenth century after the destructive fire of 1424.[96] For instance, in 1465 payment was made for the repaid and covering of the new kitchen, while, between 24 June 1469 and 13 October 1470 the master of works, Henry Livingstone accounted for expenditure totalling over £248.[97] Between 1428 and 1437, the surviving accounts of the masters of work at Linlithgow Palace and the accounts of the custumers of Linlithgow revealed a total expense of at least £4,518.[98] The Linlithgow accounts for that period and other references provided sufficient evidence to prove that the cash for these works was drawn directly from income derived from crown lands and the great customs.[99] However, by the mid 1460s a large proportion of the £482 paid to Henry Livingstone as Master of Works at Linlithgow Palace originated from the treasurer and it would seem that in the following decade this branch of royal expenditure was almost completely associated with the treasurer.[100]

Although it cannot be doubted that James IV brought a new dimension to the scope of public works, many of the buildings in the treasurers' accounts of James IV had been built or repaired during previous reigns.

---

95. ER, iv, 485, 554, 555, 579, v, 10, 458, vii, 656, viii, 134. TA, i, cclxiv.

96. Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, Midlothian and West Lothian, 219-231.

97. ER, vii, 320, viii, 135.

98. ER, iv, 449, 451, 485, 554, 555, 579.

99. ER, v, 11, vi, 418, 625-6, vii, 291.

100. TA. i. 74. ER. vii. 656-7.

In the reigns of James I and II, large sums of money were spent on additional buildings at Edinburgh and Stirling castles and also at Leith.[101] Repairs to Stirling castle were being undertaken during the regency of the Albanys and the reign of James I when over £560 was contributed from the customs accounts of Stirling for work on various portions of the castle.[102] In 1459 on the death of the countess of Lennox, the receipts from the earldom were appropriated by the king to contribute to building expenses at Stirling castle.[103] Also, during the first half of the fifteenth century, large sums of money were expended on repairing sections of Edinburgh castle, including the kitchen, the gate and the porter's lodge.[104] In the 1434 and 1435 accounts of Robert Gray, master of work at the castle and also at Leith docks, £1,624 represented the outlay on walls, timber and contruction of a great chamber and the building of the royal barge at Leith.[105] Throughout the reign of James II the castle at Edinburgh was being constantly renovated. In 1445 £50 was allowed by the custumars of Edinburgh to lord Crichton for the cost of repairing the roof of the great chamber.[106] Revenue was also expended on other ventures, in 1413 £79-15-6 was delivered from the customs of Inverness to contribute to the reconstruction of Elgin Cathedral,[107] in 1434 friar John Bute received

---

101. ER, iv, 565, 577, 605, v, 3, vi, 595.

102. ER, iv, 5, 45, 138, 172, 197, 216, 245, 271, 292, 311, 403, 435, 468, 502, 528, 565, 605. In 1434 and 1435 the accounts of Alexander Gulde, master of work at the castle, have survived. ER, iv, 565. 605.

103. ER, vi, 543.

104. ER, iv, 143, 603.

105. ER, iv, 577, 726.

106. ER, v, 180.

107. ER, iv, 173. In 1390 the Cathedral had been burned by Alexander 'the wolf of Badenoch' and royal revenues were employed to assist in its reconstruction.

£120 from the customs of Perth for construction of the Carthusian monestary in the burgh,[108] while in 1443 £10 was assigned for the repair of the king's dwelling house within the burgh of Aberdeen.[109] Large sums of money were spent on building projects during the three year widowhood of Mary of Guelders, although the incentive probably originated from James II. From 1460 to 1463 a total of £604 was derived from the issues of crown lands, customs and burgh farms and submitted to David Boys, master of works at Ravenscraig castle, near Dysart, which Stewart Cruden has descibed as 'standing alone as an artillery fort among the many castellated structures of the troubled fifteenth century'.[110] In addition, a further £1,071 was expended from similar sources on the construction of Trinity College near Edinburgh under the supervision of John Halkerstone and Edward Bonkle.[111] Evidence concerning building activity during the reign of James III is unfortunately scanty since around this period the responsibility for such expenditure was gradually removed from the local accounts to the treasurer. Although the sole surviving treasurer's account for the reign recorded the expenses of workmen ' as in contenit in the buke of the Comptaris deliueransis to the Masteris of Werk, for the quhilk thai sall ansuer', the lack of any further accounts renders it an impossible task to exact extent of building under James III.[112]

---

108. ER, iv, 563. This was one of numerous submissions to assist the construction of the monestary; 482 English nobles were extracted from the issues of the tax for the king's ransom, £40-1-8 Flemish groats was paid by John Turing in Bruges while miscellaneous smaller payments were also recorded. ER, iv, 613, 640, 678. The monestary was founded by James I and was well endowed by the crown. ER, iv, cxiii.

109. ER, v, 134.

110. ER, vii, 59, 77, 138, 153, 171, 172, 174, 175, 197, 216, 217, 253, Cruden, The Scottish Castle, 212

111. ER, vii, 91, 164, 167, 168, 173, 217, 241.

112. TA, i, 74.

However, under James IV, and later under the supervision of his son, James V, a fresh impetus was given to the royal building programme. In 1492 the treasurer expended £129 on masons, carters, workmen and wrights, 'be his buke of expens tharofs examinit and scheis uppone compt'.[113] The majority of the building projects recorded in the treasurer's discharge were financed by advanced payments by that official to various masters of work, for which the latter was subsequently called to account. Between 1502 and 1505, for instance, payments for work at Stirling, Falkland and Holyrood were submitted to Andrew Ayton, the vicar of Greich and Andrew Mathieson, and Master Leonard Logy respectively.[114] These masters of work do not seem to have participated in the design of the building, but merely acted as financial agents, collecting money advanced by the treasurer and supervising its expenditure. In general, the masters of the work paid the wages of the various workmen and craftsmen on the actual site and other miscellaneous day to day expenses. On 3 August 1507, William, bishop of Aberdeen and eleven others were commissioned by the king 'to here and ressave the comptis of Andro Aytoun, capitane of Strivelin, of all soumes ressavit be him of our soverane lordis casualite and cofferis in al tymes begain' since 17 December 1497 concerning the building at Stirling castle, the Gray Friar's church at Stirling, the park, orchards and pools at Stirling and 'the hewing and carying of tymmer furth of divers woddis to the kingis schippis in Leith, and al utheris his expens made in the kingis use'.[115] Similar arragnements were entered into with masters of work present at other sites of royal building.

---

113. TA, i, 204.

114. TA, ii, 269-281.

115 RSS, i, 1515.

In addition, the treasurer's discharge also recorded payments directly to master masons and tradesmen under contract to the king. Between 1502 and 1505 the various masons at Holyrood Place received sums of money from the treasurer for work on a particular portion of the construction; Walter Merlien received £360 for 'his task of the foirwerk' and the new Hall(chapel), William Turnbull £80-13-4 for work on the galleries and windows, Michael Wright received £206-8-8 fro constructing the queen's great chamber and John Workston was paid £21-7/- for ending and topping the chimneys.[116] On 13 June 1506 it was stated that John Lokhart, mason, had received a total of 1,600 marks for his work on the 'foryet of Strivelin.. and sa all payit fer the said werk at divers tymes as the bukis beris'.[117] Master masons were generally under contract to the crown for the completion of a specific piece of construction and by this arrangement they received payment of the expenses incurred and supervised the work of other masons. Also Thomas Peebles, glass wright, was paid various sums for the provision of glass windows at various buildings, but from 1504 he was granted annually 20 marks from the farm of the lands of Larbertsheil in Stirlingshire for life in return for the provision of glass to the royal palaces in Linlithgow, Falkland, Holyrood and Stirling.[118] Sepcial services were normally paid for separately, as, in 1496 when £5 was submitted to John Mawar, the younger, for thatching the work house at Edinburgh castle.[119]

The level of wages naturally depended on the skill of the tradesman. Ordinary labourers, journeymen, artificers, and carters received wages ranging from 6d to 1/- as day,[120] presumably depending on the work and

---

116. TA, ii, 269, 270, 279.

117. TA, iii, 88.

118. TA, ii, 277, 280. ER, xii, 214, 334, 402, 539. RSS, i, 2116.

119. TA, i, 310.

120. TA, i, cclxxiii, 296, iv, 452, 526.

skill involved, while more highly talented workmen might receive from 3/- to 5/- a day.[121] At the other end of the scale, masons, apart from receiving allowances for their work in the actual building accounts, were paid monthly or annual fees. In 1497 Thomas Barr and John Merlion received quarterly fees of £3-17/- and Thomas Cunningham £2-17/- for the three months.[122] However, some master masons who had been actively engaged in the royal building programme were granted substantial pensions by the crown. In 1499, Walter Merlion was gifted a fee of £40 annually for life for his services,[123] while the Italian mason, Cressent received a wage of £7 a month.[124] Also, an annual life pension of £40 was granted to Master Leonard Logy for his services to the construction of Holyrood Palace.[125] Gifts of drinksilver were frequently granted to masons working on the royal palaces and although normally only a few shillings, occasionally larger allowances were received.[126]

Without delving into architectural detail, it is necessarey to mention the various types of buildings erected by the crown under James IV and also the relative costs. The first, and by far the most important group of buildings, were the aplaces, namely Stirling, Falkland, Linlighgow and Holyroodhouse. During the early part of the reign of James IV, considerable sums of money were spent on the south side of the palace of Linlithgow, and extension to the construction begun by James I and II. Between 1450 and 1492 the treasurer was allowed the sum of £878 for the expense of construction work on the palace, the cost of building a 'park dyke' and the purchase of wood.[127] Between February 1496-7 and

---

121. TA, i, 245, ii, 271.
122. TA, i, 367.
123. TA, ii, 94, 333.
124. TA, iv, 271.
125. RMS, ii, 2752. TA, ii, 335.
126. TA, i, 181. For special services, the masons of Falkland received 54/- or three unicorns in drinksilver.
127. TA. i, 195, 204.

June 1498 a further £242 was expended on the palace.[128] However, from 1500 there was a sharp reduction in the amount of money spent on building at Linlithgow with just over £400 being allowed for the period 1502 to 1513. In 1513 a detailed account of the £109 expended on Linlithgow Palace was recorded in the appendix to the fourth volume of the Accounts of the Treasurer. Although no large scale construction was undertaken on the palace at this time, money was being continually expended on a variety of minor items, on the purchase of nails, locks, small quantities of wood, lime, glass and slates and the wages of those labouring at the site. For instance £7 was allowed to William, Frenchman, for making organs and mason Stephen Balty and his apprentices were in receipt of £19-7/- for nineteen weeks work.[129] But, as with other public works accounts, a full assessment of the total amount expended in the first decade of the sixteenth century is impossible since no treasurers' accounts have survived for the three years between 1508 and 1511. From the accounts which have survived, it would appear that James IV concentrated by far the largest portion of money allotted to public works on the edifice inside Stirling castle known as the Palice. Construction probably commenced in 1496 with the payments of 6/8 to Walter Merlion, mason, 'in erlis of his condicioun of bigging of the Kingis hous'.[130] During the remainder of the reign constant payments were made from the treasurers' accounts both to the masters of work, sir Thomas Smith, the abbot of Lindoris, Andrew Ayton, chamberlain of the lordship of Stirlingshire from Whitsum 1500,[131] and Robert Callendar, for the general expenses at the site, and also to the various masons for specific portions of constructions; John and Walter Merlion for the 'King's house', John Yorkstone for 'handling the foretower and working on the old

---

128. TA, i, 319-394.

129. TA, iv, 522-5

130. TA, i, 277. 'Erlis' was contract money, that is money given on the confirmation of a bargain or contract.

131. ER, xi, 312.

hall and old church, and finally John Lockart for constructing the fore and 'yet' towers.[132] In addition to money expended on the actual building at Stirling, an effort was made to create more pleasant surroundings to the castle. It would appear that a new garden and orchard were set out, probably in the valley of the castle rock. In the accounts of the early sixteenth century, there were numerous entries relating to the stocking of the garden with hedges, pear and willow trees, the construction of a fish pond, the stocking it with swans, pike and other fish, and the construction of better roads.[133] Although by no means confined to these years, the bulk of the expenditure on the building of the palace and other edifices at Stirling castle was concentrated in the years 1500 to 1508, for a total of over £10,700 was allowed to the treasurer for that purpose. As well as Linlithgow and Stirling, James IV, between the dates mentioned above, spent about £3,800 and £3,200 respectively on construction work at Holyroodhouse and Falkland. The former, first mentioned in 1501 under Master Leonard Logy, master of work, was probably conceived for the arrival of the new queen from England, and, although work was well underway on the foregate, chapel, gallery and great hall before the king's marriage, the bulk of the work on the tower, seems to have occurred between 1504 and 1505.[134] Between 1502 and 1505 a total of £3,400 was spent on the new palace of Holyrood. Also in 1501 work began remodelling the old castle at Falkland, which was designed not so much as a fortress but more as a centre of recreation, especially hunting. Like Holyroodhouse, the majority of the building activity was confined to the years 1502-5, when £2,650 was spent on the construction of the building. Being a centre of sport and leisure, considerable expense was incurred in the purchase of

---

132. TA, i, 277, ii, 85, 270, 276, iii, 82, 83, 296.

133. TA, ii, 31-4, 394, 396.

134. TA, ii, 87, 269, 273, iii, 84-7.

roebucks, does, deer nets and royal stags.[135] In addition a loch was constructed near the palace and stocked with pike and swans.[136] The process of remodelling these established royal residences, based more on a desire for comfort than security, was initiated by James IV and largely completed by his son, James V. These 'palatial' constructions witnessed the introduction of the influence of European Renaissance workmanship which seems to have begun with the great hall in Stirling castle.[137]

As well as royal residences, James IV sustained the cost of the building of the 'Kirk of Steil', a new church erected in the parish of Upsetlington, dedicated to the Virgin Mary and subsequently called Ladykirk.[138] The construction, begun in 1501 seems to have continued until 1513 at an accumulated cost to the treasurer of £1,167. Also during his reign James IV did not neglect the repair of royal fortresses in various parts of the country. By order of Parliament in 1488, the castle of Dunbar was to be dismantled, by, by 1497 its potential as a border fortress in a war with England was realised by James IV and its reconstruction was initiated.[139] Between 1497 and 1501 the rebuilding was undertaken by the king's mason Walter Merlion, with sir Andrew Wood appointed both keeper of the castle and master of work, and the treasurer was allowed at least £735 for the task.[140] In February 1497-8 £233-6-8 was given to Walter Ogilvy in payment 'for the reparatioun of the tua gemmel touris of Inuernes'.[141] James also paid out £580 for the repair of Lochmaben castle and in addition constructed a hall at Methven castle.[142]

---

135. TA, ii, 120, 344, 407, 474.
136. TA, ii, 448,461.
137. For details concerning the architectural details see Cruden, The Scottish Castle, 144-149.
138. Second Statistical Account of Scotland, Berwickshire, 181. Swintons of that Ilk, lxxvii.
139. APS, ii, 211.
140. TA, i, 328-389, ii, 86-7. ER, xi, 75, 76, 149, 151, 153, 156. The cost was probably greater than that figure since there were no accounts for the period July 1498, to February 1500-1.
141. TA, i, 376. 142. TA, i, 117, 276, ii, 278-81.

Although, by the reign of James IV, a substantial portion of the finance for public works was derived from the treasurer, there are still references to bills being met by local accountants. In 1512 the chamberlain of Fife was allowed £200 for payment to William Thomas, mason, for the construction of the hall at Falkland while, a year later, the same official contributed a further £140 to offset the cost of constructing a garden wall or 'le bermkin' at Falkland.[143] It is possible that local sources of revenue were used, expecially in the expensive years before Flodden to assist the already over-subscribed treasurers' accounts.

Although James IV has acquired a reputation as the creator of the Scottish navy, it must be stated that, despite the fact that he did spend vast sums of money on its extention and development it was based on the initial efforts of James I and III. During the reign of James I £40 was allowed from the customs of Dundee in 1425 for the purchase of a ship from Devid of Aberchirder and Nicholas Scrimgeour for royal use.[144] In addition, James seems to have frequently employed John Hannay of Aberdeen to supervise the use and furnishing of vessels under royal control.[145] In 1434 and 1435 a royal barge was being constructed at Leith.[146] In the latter year, £199 was spent on the erection of buildings at Leith, £122 on the construction of the king's barge, £25 for building a new vessel ('navicule') for the queen, £43 for general naval repairs and victuals for sailors, £36 for the renovation of the ship, called 'Kale' and £50 for the expenses of James Johnson, in victuals and fees, to procure a mast for the king's barge from Zeeland.[147] 48 English nobles from the ransom contribution of the burgh of Montrose was also paid to Robert Gray of Leith

---

143. ER, xiii, 430, 505.
144. ER, iv, 383.
145. ER, iv, 408, 433, 470.
146. ER, iv, 575, 625.
147. ER, iv, 626.

for the consttuction of the barge.[148] James III undoubtedly laid the final foundation for the upsurge of naval activity under James IV, for it was he who obtained two ships, the "Flower' and the 'Yellow Carvel' and also recruited the services of sir Andrew Wood of Largo, a former Leith merchant-sailor.[149] However, apart from Pitscottie's reference to Wood's defeat of an English fleet under Stephen Bull, there is little concrete evidence about his career during the reign of James III, but, in the preamble to his feu charter to the lands of Largo in Fife, dated 18 March 1482-3, it was stated that the grant was in recompense for his services and damage sustained in his military role, 'both on land and on sea'.[150] In 1483 the auditors of the Exchequer were ordered by James III to allow and discharge the rest of George Robinson as custumar of Edinburgh and, included in the entries listed, was £90 to Thomas Preston 'quhen he past in Orkinnay for the hame brigin of the schip with wyne' and £336 'for the biggin of two roll bargis of ouris and graith that the said George bocht and expensis that he made tharapon'.[151]

In the 1494 account of George Shaw, abbot of Paisley, a detailed account was recorded of the expenditur of George Galbraith, master of work for 'the Kingis rowbarge byggyte in Dunbertaine' and other ships, and the repair of the 'Christopher', amounting to £517.[152] The account contained a variety of expenses, namely the wages of workmen, wrights, sawers and smiths, the cost of the supply of wood, iron and coal, the expense of carriage and storing and finally the cost of raising an old ship which had

---

148. ER, iv, 666.

149. Reid, Skipper from Leith, 16. Sir Andrew Wood and the two vessels mentioned were used in the defeat of Stephen Bull and his three ships in 1490. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, 225-7.

150. RMS, ii, 1563.

151. ER, ix, 218.

152. TA, i, 245-54.

sunk in the water near Dumbarton. However, until 1500 naval construction was not an outstanding feature of the treasurers' accounts, but from 1502 to 1508 James 1V spent a total of £20,670 on the building, furnishing and provisioning of his ships, and between 1511 and 1513 a further £17,720 was expended in this field.[153] These figures are confined to the sums disbursed only by the treasurer.

By far the largest item of expediture was the construction of ships in the royal dockyards. Although shipbuilding was carried out at Dumbarton and other locations in Scotland, the bulk of naval building was performed either at the pool of Airth in Stirlingshire or at Newhaven, close to Edinburgh.[154] Although Airth seems to have housed a harbour before the days of James IV, in September 1511, Robert Callendar, constable of Stirling, received £60 as part payment of £240 'of his task for the kastein of thre dokkis and the biggein of ane stable for fiftie hors at the Polerth', and a further £156 was spent constructing a 'dok to the gret schip' and furnishing supplies to meat, drink, coal, and candles to sailors and workmen labouring at the Pool on the 'Margarer', 'James' and the 'Lark'.[155] During the reign of James IV, the principal dockyard was located at Newhaven not only because of its close proximity to Edinburgh but also on account of the depth of water at that point. The construction of this dock was begun in May 1504 and during the next few years psyments were recorded in the treasurers discharge for the purchase of materials and allowances to Master Leonard Logy 'to the werk of the schip and Havin'.[156]

---

153. See Apprndix No.

154. The Halls, Orchardland and 16 cruives of Airth were crown property and were recorded in the Rentals.

155. TA, iv, 280-1. For details of the role of docks in Medieval Shipbuilding, see TA, iv, xlvi-Ll

156. TA, ii, 276-281.

Although the dock fell into the possession of the burgh of Edinburgh in March 1510-11, it continued to be employed for the building of the king's navy.[157] It was at Newhaven that the 'great Michael' was constructed.

By far the most extensive and lavish vessel constructed in Scottish docks during the reign of James IV was the 'The Great Michael' or 'greit schip'. Unfortunately there is no reliable guide as to the dimension of the vessel although Pitscottie, a frequent exponent of the hyperbole, claimed that the ship measured 240 feet in length and 36 feet in breadth, consumed all the timer in Fife, except for the forest of Falkland, as well as imported wood from Norway, took Scottish and foreign carpenteres over a year to construct and possessed thirty two large guns and a host of small artillery.[158] Also, according to the same chronicler, the vessel was constructed at a total cost of £30,000, discounting the provision of artillery.[159] Since the treasurers' accounts for the period of the building of the ship are missing, it is impossible to defend of refute Pitscottie's statement of the cost of the 'Great Michael' but it is unlikely to have cost so high a figure. The first entry concerning the 'greit schip' appeared in 7 August 1506 with the payment of £42 to James Wilson of Dieppe for the cost of freighting planks and trees 'to the greit schip'.[160] Since work on the 'Great Michael' must have got underway by 1507 it seems likely that most of the £3,191 paid to sir William Melville master of work for the navy, was spent on the king's prize venture.[161] The bulk of the ship's construction would have occurred between that date and 1511, when, on 12 October, 14/- was distributed among three Scottish

---

157. RMS, ii, 3551.

158. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, 251. The fact that wood from Falkland was not used in the building of the vessel was undoubtedly because Falkland forest was a royal hunting reserve.

159. Hume Brown, History of Scotland, 344.

160. TA, iii, 295.

161. TA, iv, 44-48.

trumpeters 'playand at the outputting of the Kingis gret schips'.[162]

Between 1502 and 1507 a substantial proportion of the £12,600 paid to Master Leonard Logy, sir William Melville and others was used to finance the building of the 'Margaret'. From the account, it would appear that the ship took all of five years to construct. Although the largest addition to the navy at the time of it completion, the 'Margaret' was indeed not the only one. Concurrent with the construction of the "Margaret', the treasurer also sustained the cost of the building of another vessel at Dumbarton, for which he submitted almost £700 between 1505 and 1507, mostly to the provost of the burgh, for the ordinary building expenses.[163] Probably on account of lack of building facilities in Scotland, James IV was compelled to contract for the building of certain ships abroad. Between April 1505 and September 1506 a ship call the 'Treasurer' was commissioned to be constructed in Brittany under the supervision of Martin le Nault, 'ane merchant of Conquat'. By the latter date, at least £200 had been allowed to the treasurer for that purpose, leaving a rest of 1050 franks or £525 still outstanding, which debt was quickly cleared when Robert Barton was sent to France with the money.[164]

The figures mentioned above represented only the day to day costs on the actual site, principally fees and wages, but a large portion of the cost of naval construction included the purchase, collection and carriage of raw materials. Although in the accounts of February 1504-5 and August 1506 the sums expended on materials were included separately in the individual sections concerned with building and shipping in the accounts of 1507 and 1508, materials for both undertakings were accounted

---

162. TA, iv, 313.

163. TA, ii, 281-8, iii, 82-91, 295-8.

164. TA, iii, 135, 335, 341. Le Conquet was situated near Brest. At this time the French frank was valued at 10/- Scots.

in a single section, making it extremely difficult to distinguish whether certain commodities were bound for the building site or the docks. Thus, to avoid confusion and repetition, it has been found advantageous to consider the question of the general supply of raw materials.at this point, since, in any case, there was little variation in the types of material purchased for either activity.

In shipbuilding, and to a lesser extent, in public works, wood was a vital commodity. As a result the surviving Scottish forests were systematically denuded during the reign of James IV in a desperate attempt to secure sufficient quantities of wood for these projects. Expeditions in search of large quantities of wood were frequently organized to locations all over Scotland. Between 20 November 1502 and 29 March 1503 a total of £104-11-2 was allowed to the treasurer for the fees and wages of timbermen and sawers accumulating timber in the wood of Cambusnethan, while on 26 June, sir Alexander Makison received £7 'to pas in the Hieland to cheis tymir for the schip and the wricht with him.[165] Considerable revenue was saved if wood could be found at a location close to the building site, as in the building of the great row-barge at Dumbarton in 1494-5 when a large portion of the timber employed was felled on the shores of Loch Lomond and floated down the river Leven from Balloch to Dumbarton. A close examination of the details of that particular account provided an excellent insight into the costs involved in such an oparation. £6-17-8 was allowed for the wages of the wrights felling, squaring and cleaning the timber, £9-2-6 to sawers for 'sawen of the tymmer', engaged for over eight weeks at a 1/- a day and £21-7-10 for the cost of transporting the timber to the burgh of Dumbarton.[166] Because of the difficulty of overland transportation most of the timber arrived at the construction site

---

165. TA, ii, 281-2

166. TA, i, 246-248.

by sea or river. The cost was often fairly substantial, for, on 24 May 1512 Dougal Campbell presented a bill of £32-1/- to the treasurer for the expense of cutting trees for masts and a further 100 trees for 'a little boat' from the forest at Loch Ness, carrying them to the sea, the provision of salmon, ale and bread for one workman, and the cost of freight in a Dutch vessel.[167] However, there was obviously only a limited supply of native wood available despite numerous acts of Parliament protecting existing forests and encouraging the plantation of new ones. In 1504, the same body announced that 'the wod of Scotland is utterlie distroyit'.[168] In order to preserve the flow of wood for these operations, is was found necessary to import large quantities from foreign sources, mainly from Scandanavia but occassionally from Franee.[169] The cost of purchase and transportation to Scotland was borne by the treasurer. Supplies of a wide variety of timbers were continually being brought to Scotland by merchants, both native and foreign, probably in conjunction with their own trading ventures. These merchants were paid in advance for the cost of the materials required and would have received additional payment for their services and also for freight charges. The Bartons were frequently employed as royal suppliers. On 4 May 1508 a total of £737-15-11 in franks was supplied to Robert Barton for the purchase of a variety of naval provisions, including 1325 feet of 'gret sarris', at three sous a foot, 6140 feet of 'sarris pullan and plank', 301 large and 91 short trees, and £250 which Robert conveyed to James Wilson and William Cristall for timber which Barton had left behind in France. The latter was also called upon to pay various uncosts, namely carriage, customs and drinksilver to various labourers.[170] In fact, native merchants George Paterson,[171],

---

167. TA, iv, 296-7
168. APS, ii, 6, 7, 51, 242.
169. TA, iv, 46, 47, 289, 373, 452.
170. TA, iv, 46-7.
171. TA, iv, 286, 288, 291, 300-2.

William Brownhill,[172] James Simpson,[173] and James Merchiston,[174] and foreigners Kasper Lepus,[175] John Werre,[176] and Anthony Gervaise,[177] frequently acted as royal suppliers of cordage, wood, iron, guns, copper and other materials necessary for public works and royal construction.[178] The cost of a consignment of wood obviously depended on the type of wood supplied. Large amounts of different kinds of timber were imported into Scotland; in 1505-6 'Eastland boards cost' from between 1/4 and 2/- each, trees anywhere from 10d to 6/-, depending on the length (the 6/- tree measured 32 feet in length), oak trees at 1/1 each, joists at between 8/- and 11/- each, refters at 7d each and 'Swethin' or Swedish boards at 8d each.[179] Masts were an expensive commodity for, in the same year, £100 was given to Master Leonard Logy 'quhen he passit in Ingland to by the mast to the schip'.[180] In 1512 a Dutch skipper received £222 as full payment for the supply of twenty two mats bought in Denmark and shipped to Scotland.[181]

In both naval construction and public works, iron was an indispensable item and again large quantities had to be imported mainly from France, Spain and Flanders. Raw iron was constantly being imported into Scotland in large quantities. For the year ending August 1508, at total of 255 walls of iron was purchased abroad by royal agents and shipped to Scotland at a cost of £350.[182] Apart from wood and iron, other building materials such as stone, lime and sand, were largely extracted locally, and, although

---

172. TA, iv, 284, 300-3, 305, 306.
173. TA, iv, 300-7.
174. TA, ii, 241, 242, 242, 287.
175. TA, iv, 276.
176. TA, i, 290.
177. TA, iv, 276, 378.
178. For details of these purchases, See TA, vols. i-iv.
179. TA, iii, 82-91.
180. TA, ii, 82-9. 'The schip' was undoubtedly the 'Margaret'.
181. TA, iv, 295.
182. TA, iv, 45-8.

small sums were paid to quarriers for the excavation of stone and for the purchase of lime, the cost was comparatively small.[183] The materials employed in the construction of Linlithgow Palace came from local sources, sandstone from a quarry in Kincavil only one and a half miles distant and the lime from Gormyre near Torphichen.[184] However, for both building and shipping, wood and iron proved to be the most expensive materials, for between 1505 and 1507, the period when the 'Margaret' was being constructed, £1,458 and £303 was spent respectively on these commodities. Copper was also purchased in fairly substantial quantities for naval construction, for in 1508 102½ stones were bought at a cost of £109-6-8 or 1/4 a pound, to make 'sheaves' or blocks for ships tackle.[185] In addition tar, pitch, coarse flax, resin and numerous other commodities were required in Medieaval ship building. In fitting out of the 'Margaret', over £750 was spent on cordage, tackle, rope, nails and other smaller items and in addition £125 was spent by the treasurer on flags. standards, compases, lanterns, cross-bows, axes, brigantines and other gear.[186] Concerning armaments, £20 was submitted for the purchase of twenty one guns which must have been small in size, but it is likely that heavier ordnance was brought from Edinburgh castle to the vessel.[187] Anchors were also an expensive commodity, for, in 1508 £400 was paid in Spain to the factor of George Makeson for 'ankiris comin hame' and a further £93 was allowed to the treasurer for another two anchors bought.[188]

Above the actual cost of constructing a vessel, the treasurer was also required to sustain the cost of furnishing the ship with equipment

---

183. TA, i, 354, iv, 279, 377, 524, 525.
184. H.M.S.O. Publication; Linlithgow Palace, 6.
185. TA, iv, 47.
186. TA, iii, 82-91, 295-8.
187. TA, ii, 90, 142.
188. TA, iv, 27, 48.

and victuals sufficient for the intended voyage. Victualling was often and expensive business, as in 1504, when the cost of preparing for naval participation in the expedition to the Isles amounted to around £500. Expenditure included the cost of supplying sixteen tuns of wine, ten chalders of meal and the victuals provided by John Smollet, brugess of Dumbarton between 17 August and St.John's day 1504, carriage and freight charges and the hiring of sailors for the expedition.[189] Ships on diplomatic missions and contracted to transport royal supplies to Scotland were furnished and provisioned at the king's expense.[190] In fact, any vessel commissioned by the crown was entitled to claim the expenses for the journey. On 26 June 1512 Dougal Campbell received £40 'for marinaris fais, victualing, and all furnesing of ane schip of the Kingis to pas to Air to the Ilis for Spanyartis geir quhilkis ware schipbrokin' in the lands of Dougal Ranald Allanson.[191] As well as specific missions, the treasurer sustained the cost of supplying food, drink and other necessities to the ships of the king's navy. In February 1512-3 the 'Margaret' and 'James' were docked at Newhaven and the sailors and others on board were provided with quantities of ale, bread, mutton, feef, hering, codlings, salmon, coal and candle at the total cost of £86-12-2.[192] On Sunday, 17 July 1513 'the Great Michael' lay at Leith with 200 men on board and was supplied with one last of fresh ale, costing £24, two fresh marts and 600 fresh loaves of bread, and during the following week, the 'greit schip' was provided with an additional $5\frac{1}{2}$ fresh marts and 1200 fresh fish.[193] Wnen the ship was in port fresh supplies were provied daily for the crew but

189. TA, ii, 428, 429, 434, 442, 475.
190. TA, iv, 125, 128, 289, 294.
191. TA, iv, 297.
192. TA, iv, 468-71.
193. TA, iv, 485-6. A last consisted of twelve barrels, which in turn consisted of twelve gallons, and each gallon cost 20d.

the quantity of provisions taken on board was considerably larger when the vessel was about to depart. For instance, in July 1513 the bark of James Douglas with a crew of one hundred and thirty men, was furnished with bread and ale at the cost of £140, twenty salted marts which belonged to the king, one chalder of oat meal, large quantities of 'stok fysche' and 'keling', two stone of candle, half a barrel of butter, two fresh marts and one barrel of salmon.[194] Although the majority of the provisions were purchased by the treasurer, a sizeable portion originated from the royal larder or were purchased from the local customs of landed accounts.[195] Despite the fact that there seemed to be a constant flow of victuals to the king's ships during the year before Flodden, nevertheless, complaints of neglect were recorded. On 2 January 1512-3, three pipes of ale, two hundred loaves of bread and seven salted marts were purchased and delivered to the 'bark of Traport', berthed at that time in Newhaven, undoubtedly in response to the complaint that 'thai (the sailors) deand for falt of wittalis'.[196] Further in 1512 Robert Barton was contracted to victual the bark, 'Gabriel', which he completed at the cost of £65-18-6, but it was stated that 'the said schip salit nocht, and than the Kingis grace causit me to wittall hir new agane'. The reason for the delay in departure is not recorded, perhaps adverse weather conditions, but the delay cost the treasurer an extra £12.[197]

As well as food and drink, the royal ships were provided with a variety of additional utensils and furnishings. In November 1512 this included the purchase of a dozen shovels 'for the castin of the gait to the mast', nails of various types, staples and bolts, coal and heather

---

194. TA, iv, 500. 'Keling' was a large cod. 'Stok fysche was

195. ER, xiii, 487, 488. TA, iv, 498, 499, 500.

196. TA, iv, 462.

197. TA, iv, 459.

for fuel, clay to make the ship's hearth, a kettle, small anchors and axes.[198] Throughout the detailed shipping accounts of 1512-3, such entires were a numerous as they were various.

A large proportion of the money spent on the navy was detailed for the payment of the wages and fees of sailors, wrights, gunners and skippers. In the period from September 1511 to July 1512, weekly wages ranged from £125 to £175 for the period of one month, while monthly wages amounted to between £176 and £255 for the same period.[199] These regular figures probably applied to a permanent complement of sailors and tradesmen, but, when at sea the humbers employed were increased considerably. In December 1512, for instance, only two sailors received in the 'Margaret' a wage allowance of £3-10/- - it would appear that in common with castles not in actual occupation, only a skeleton staff remained on a ship which lay idle in harbour - however, by the following February the 'Margaret', now docked at Leith, retained a complement of thirty six men, and by July 1513, when the fleet prepared for the conflict with England, master Alexander Leslie and John Barton received wages for a hundred sailors and wrights and five gunners.[200] As late as June 1513 messengers were being sent to Fife, Galloway, Stirlingshire, Clydesdale, East Lothian and the north west of Scotland in order to recruit seamen for the navy.[201] It would appear that nem constantly shifted from ship to ship since, of the fifty six mariners attached to the 'James', twenty eight were also listed as sailors of the "Margaret'.[202] The situation was extremely fluid, with shortages in the full complement being filled by man hired only for a

198. TA, iv, 457-8.
199. TA, iv, 287, 288.
200. TA, 461, 470, 490.
201. TA, iv, 412, 413.
202. TA, iv, 505-6.

specific period. Although the average crew was composed of natives of Scotland, some foreignes like Domenico the Spaniard and Pernot the Frenchman were evident in the lists.[203] From the lists of 1513, the customary wage rates seem to have been as follows; the average shipwright received a wage of £3-12/- a month, although highly skilled foreign wrights like Jacat Terrell and Martin the Fleming were in receipt of £10 and £14 a month respectively (th latter wage included 'his man'), seamen's wages averaged around 32/- to 35/- a month (1/- a day) while the monthly wage of gunners varied considerably according to experience, Hans Stowling and his servant were paid £5-10/- monthly and Wolf and 'his man' £4-18/-, but the four Scottish gunners of the 'Margaret' received only around 40/- a month.[204] An inherent shortage of skilled and experienced craftsmen in Scotland compelled James IV to import the services of foreign wrights, gunners, armourers and masons. Apart from high wages, other attractions were directed at these trademen to ensure their employment. In August 1506 Robert Barton received a total of £99 for delivery to certain French shipwights contracted to come to Scotland 'in thair feis beforehand' and 'for vittaling of the said wrichtis in tua schippes'.[205] Workmen and labourers working at the docks seem to have received wages similar to those paid to sailors. However, in March 1513, twenty four workmen received 1/4 'for a day and ane nycht' to hastily release a vessel belonging to John Barton, when it ran aground on a sandbank at Newhaven.[206] Carters transporting material from either Leith or Edinburgh castle to the docks at Newhaven usually charged 2/- for each 'draucht', although it might be as low as 8d.[207] Smiths not only provided such materials as nails, bolts,

---

203. TA, iv, 503, 504
204. TA, iv, 502, 507.
205. TA, iii, 295.
206. TA, iv, 474.
207. TA, iv, 452, 453, 456.

chisels and other tools, but they were also paid for their labour or 'maid work', usually at the rate of 1/4 a stone, but occassionally as high as 5/8 a stone of work.[208] Skippers of the king's ships appear to have been will paid for their services, Alexander Routh, skipper of the 'Great Michael' received £7 a month, Pernot a Frenchman, gained £8-2/- for the same period and John Barton, commander of the 'Margaret' and his servant gained a monthly allowance of £5-12/-.[209] James IV retained no full time naval commanders, but instead empolyed experienced merchant-privateers to command his ships when required. In 1504 the king's fleet sailed from Dumbarton in an attempt to reduce the castle of Cairnburgh and many of Scotland's leading seamen participated in the venture, namely sir Andrew Wood of Largo, commander of the expedition until replace by the earl of Arran,[210] John Merchiston, later captain of the 'Columb',[211] Robert Barton and Hans, the king's German Gunner.[212] On this, and other naval expeditions, James IV relied heavily on the experience of these sea captain and merchant venturers, whom he was not slow to reward. Of these, two stand out above the rest both in the extent of their service to the crown and the rewards reaped. John, Robert and Andrew Barton were, a mixture of merchant, privateer, shipowner and shippers, based in Leith whose private ventures, ranging from legitimate trading [213] to open piracy,[214] were interspersed with periods of naval service to the crown. The Bartons were employed by the crown in several roles, as agents for the payment of royal debts on the continent,[215] as suppliers not only of building and naval

208. TA, iv, 452, 454, 456.
209. TA, iv, 502, 505.
210. TA, ii, 433. Sir Andrew Wood seems to have been the naval commander until 11 May when the Farioch pursuivant was sent to Edinburgh to fetch 'tua commissionis for the Ilis to the erle of Arane'.
211. TA, ii, 431, 461.
212. TA, ii, 431. Cairnburgh was part of a group of small islands which formed the Treshnish islands near Mull.
213. Ledger of Andrew Haliburton, 71, 73, 82, 89, 167, 192, 211, 236, 264, 275. SRO, Customs Books, E 71/29/1, 2, 3.
214. Reid, Skipper from Leith, 34, 39, 49-51, 79-80.
215. TA, iv, 299-300.

materials but also of clothing and a variety of commodities ranging from drugs to horses,[216] as diplomatic agents whose duries included the transportation of ambassadors to and from Scotland and the collection of the papal buuls from the see of St.Andrews,[217] and also as royal agents for the payment of wages, fees and other allowances to sailors, wrights and other workmen.[218] Through the profits derived from commercial and privateering ventures and royal patronage of the king, the family of Barton rose from the status of merchant sea captains in Leith to that of landed gentry. On 1 March 1507-8, Robert Barton 'for his good service' received a royal charter to the tower and lands of Over Barnton near Edinburgh which had fallen to the crown through the feudal casualty of recognition for which Robert submitted £466-13-4 to the treasurer for infeftment.[219] In addition Robert acquired lands in Forfarshire through purchase from John, earl of Crawford.[220] Also, on 16 October 1510, Andrew Barton invested in the adverse financial lot of the earl of Rothes whereby he received the temporary occupation of 222 marks (new extent) of the lands of barony of Ballinbreich.[221] Similarly sir Andrew Wood was rewarded for his naval services to the crown and also for his work on the reconstruction of Dunbar castle by a grant and subsequent confirmation of a feu to the lands of Largo in Fife, on which he received the additional licence of being able to construct a tower.[222] In a 1513 royal confirmation to sir Andrew Wood it can be seen how he had invested in additional landed estates in and around Largo and his influence in that area was further

---

216. TA, ii, 148, 206, 448-9, iv, 293.

217. TA, ii, 478, iv, 114, 225.

218. TA, ii, 281-3.

219. RMS, ii, 3189. TA, ii, 6. Robert made a down payment of £188-8-4. The recognition occurred through the alienation of the greater part of the land by sir William Dundas to Nicholas Borthwick.

220. RMS, ii, 3647, 3648.

221. RMS, ii, 2511. The lands were security for the repayment of the debt of £1,065-6-8 owed by the earl of Rothes to the treasurer.

222. RMS, ii, 1563, 1758, 2040, 2775. The feu 'reddendo' was fixed at £20-1/- , 26 bolls of wheat, 3 chalders 8 bolls of barley, 5 chalders of oats, 12 capons, 18 poultry and 1 hed by 1513.

augmented with the erection of 'Nethertoun and Seytoun of Largo' into a free burgh of barony.[223]

As well as constructing ships, James IV was actively engaged in the purchase of seaworthy vessels from various sources. In March 1503-4 James IV forced lord Seaton to accept £200 for the 'Eagle' after taking judicial proceedings over the latter's failure to honour a naval contract.[224] In July 1504 a little bark called the 'Columb' was either bought or hired for Robert Barton for £108-17-6, which included the cost of victuals and wages of a crew from Dieppe.[225] In 1489, the purchase of a ship and the fittings from the laird of Laucht amounted to £406,[226] while in 1505 Robert Baront was paid £150 as half the price of the ship 'Jacat'.[227] In the years immediately before Flodden James IV sttempted to increase the size of his navy through the purchase of available vessels. In 1511 the 'James' and Cloffas' were bought by John Forman at the cost of at least £200, a sum which also included the expense of purchasing an anchor and cable.[228] In the followingyear, 525 franks was delivered by George Halkerstone to John Barton who spent the money on the acquisition of the 'Trinity' later conveyed to Scotland for the king.[229] Even as late as March 1512-13, James paid £330 to Andrew Dawson and David Logan for the 'bsrk of Aberfeld', of which £200 was submitted in and £100 in placks.[230] It is clear from the evidence available that James IV drew ships into his navy from a variety of sources. The 'little English prize' or 'cach' was probably captured from the English and subsequently

---

223. RMS, ii, 3881.

224. TA, ii, 422. ADC, (Stair Society), 190-2.

225. TA, 452. In October 1504 John Merchiston was appointed her captain (TA, ii, 461). The last reference to the ship occurred in 1505 when the (Columb' was provisioned with victuals and men to sail to Arran, in which entry it was styled 'the Kingis schip' which suggested that it had actually been purchased.

226. TA, i, 125-6.

227. TA, iii, 173.

228. TA, iv, 287, 306.

229. TA, iv, 299. Cost in Scots currancy amounted to £263.

230. TA, iv, 475.

conscripted into the Scottish navy, while in 1497 James paid £35 to 'a portingale man of the west sea' for a 'broken ship', with the intention of repairing it.[231]

By 1511 the construction of naval vessles had virtually ceased and large sums of money were now being spent by the treasurer in order to prepare the fleet for the encounter against England. The vast quantity of revenue expended by James IV on these preparations, £14,327 in the year from August 1511 to the following August, and around £10,000 between the latter date and August 1513, revealed the steadfastness of his desire to establish a strong, well equipped naval force, sufficient to make an effective contribution in the forthcoming conflict. His spending in this quarter was both lavish and lacking in realism, with little regard for financial problems of the treasurer. Of the total income of £31,338 received by the treasurer during the year 1511-12, the expense of naval preparations consumed almost half and made a considerable contribution to the treasurer's deficit of almonst £7,500 over the year.[232] It is clear that as with the creation of the 'Great Michael' the fitting out of the Scottish havy during the two years prior to 1513 snowballed out of all control, leaving the treasurer to bear the brunt of the ensuing cost.

During the year 1511 to 1512 two items formed a large proportion of the naval expenses of £14,327. Firstly over £7,000 was expended by the treasurer on the purchase of naval supplies, both raw and manufactured articles. Concerning the former, £1,462 was expended on timber of various types, £165 on iron, £226 on masts, £258 on canvas for sails and £53 on both tar and tin.[233] Over £4,700 was spent on manufactured articles imported into Scotland, mainly from France and Flanders. There were

---

231. TA, i, 388, iv, 457, 506.
232. TA, iv, 173.
233. TA, iv, 284-307.

numerous entries in the treasurer's discharge for the amassing of large quantities of 'cordage' or rigging, copper pullies, cables and ship's tackle. Apartad from the cost of purchasing rigging and pullies the treasurer was also responsible for the cost of its transportation inside Scotland. In this connection between 10 September 1511 and 14 August 1512, Dokkane, carter, and a Flemish carter received £3-0-6 weekly - that is £144 for the entire period - for their expenses and also those of the king's mares in shoeing and stable fees.[234] In addition, large amounts of copper and iron were purchased abroad for naval artillery. Also James IV ordered the importation of cross bows, iron bullets for small cannons, culverings and gun stones. However, a sizeable proportion of the artillery and weapons bound for the king's ships came from the arsenal at Edinburgh castle, and the detailed accounts of 1512-3 revealed the expenses of their transportation from the catle to the docks.[235] In November 1512, for instance, carters brought three 'greit gunnys' from the castle to Leith, each gun required six carts for the journey.[236]

Some suppliers seem to have been paid directly by the treasurer while others received payment through an agent of the crown. Sir Walter Ramsey appears to have acted as master of work for the king's ships, receiving money from the treasurer and paying it out again in wages, provisions, freight and carriage charges and in payment for imports. Also, the king seems to have conducted many of his purchases in Flanders through the agency of Master James Simpson, who, being resident in the low countries, acted as James's factor. The treasurer sent the necessary cash to Simpson who bought the commodities required and organized their

---

234. TA, iv, 284-5.
235. TA, iv, 452, 454, 476.
236. TA, iv, 451.

export to Scotland.[237] On 23 May 1512 James Simpson delivered 292 pieces of copper, weighing 5500 pounds in all, to William Brownhill, who then transported the commodity in his ship from Flanders to Leith. A total of £207-4/- Scots or £69-16/- Flemish groats was sent by the treasurer to Simpson to cover the cost of purchase, 22 groats 'to the pinouris for schipeing, laying in the sellar, and for the schippir', 2/6 Flemish coin for the custom, 12 groats for the rent of the cellar and a similar sum 'for the having of it one burd'.[238] Similar commercial transactions seem to have been undertaken at Dieppe since, on 8 April, 1512 the treasurer Andrew, bishop of Caithness, received an allowance for £441-15-6 which had been delivered to John Balzard 'eftir his bill of compt' for the purchase and furnishing of a vessel in France which sailed to Newhaven with a cargo of planks. Actual payment to Balzard had been made the previous December and January in Dieppe by William Cristal and Gaveing de la Vile, factors to John Murray and George Halkerstone respectively.[239] A large portion of royal business conducted in France seems to have been undertaken through the agency of George Halkerstone. In May 1512 the treasurer was granted an allowance for £1,699 which had been entrusted to Robert Barton as the final instalment of a debt of £2,642 owed to Halkderstone for cordage, metal, timber and other commodities purchased by him for the king before this account.[240] In this case the crown seems to have been behind in its payment but sometimes the reverse also occured. In October 1511 the treasurer's account recorded the payment of £500 by John Obeyis, a Lombard, to Jerome Frescobaldi in Rouen and the latter then passed the cash on to John Balzard for rigging purchased for the king's navy 'as zit uncum to Scotland'.[241] Apart from the actual cost of the commodity

---

237. TA, iv, 300-7.
238. TA, iv, 302.
239. TA, iv, 294.
240. TA, iv, 299.
241. TA, iv, 295.

concerned the price recorded in the accounts was undoubtedly inflated both by the adverse exchange rate which affected the Scottish currency in business involving foreign specie and also by the cut extracted by these middle men.[242] For shipping these supplies, James IV relied heavily on privately owned vessels belonging to the leading merchants of Edinburgh and other major Scottish ports. Freight charges between Flanders and Scotland varied from 18/- to 20/- a ton.[243] The shipment a large quantities of naval imports frequently resulted in fairly large bills, for the treasurer was detailed to pay £31-10/- to William Brownhill for the freight of canvas, tackle, copper and brass, amounting to 31½ tons in weight.[244] In addition, foreign ship owners were also contracted by the crown to transport supplies, a necessity through the shortage of native owned vessels. On 22 and 28 March 1511-2 a Dutch skipper was paid a total of £231 'for the furnesing of him self, his schip and his marinaris' for two months for the voyage to Denmark in order to purchase masts for the ships.[245] Freight costs of the entire year amounted to £534. Other, less expensive purchases were also charged to the treasurer, items like pitch, tar, flags, standards, candles, compasses and night glasses.

The amount of revenue expended on the royal naval and building programmes during the reign of James IV was affected not only by the upsurge of interest shown by the king in these ventures but also by variation in the price of the materials involved. Fluctuations in the price of materials was affected both by the quality of the product in question and also by the country of origin, and therefore any assessment

---

242. The financial effect of bothe these features would have been included in the overall cost of the transaction. The Exchange rates involved in these commercial transactions was £1 in Flemish groats = £3 Scots
1 French Franc = 10^{s} Scots

243. TA, iv, 301, 305.

244. TA, iv, 305.

245. TA, iv, 296.

of alterations in the price index are extremely difficult to assess with and degree of accuracy. Nonetheless, it would appear that the cost of various commodities increased during the period from 1488-98 to 1511-13, for instance between these two periods, deals rose from £5 a hundred to between £15 and £18, Eastland boards rose from between £5 and £14 a hundred to between £20 and £30, tar from 16/- a barrel to 19/-, tallow from £2 a barrel to between 50/- and 58/- and Swedish baords from £5 a hundred in £1501 to between £6 and £9 in 1511.[246] Also throughout the fifteenth century the cost of imported iron seems to have increased steadily, for in 1435 Spanish iron was purchased at just over £1 a wall, by the 1490s Spanish iron was bought at between 28/- and 32/- a wall and French iron at 25/- a wall while in the final years of the reign of James IV, the normal price for imported iron was £2 a wall, rising to 46/- in 1513.[247] With the mor popular imports it is just possible to arrive at a truer impression of the price trends. For instance, between 1488 and 1498, the average cost of all types of iron amounted to 29/- a wall, with Eastland boards at £9 a hundred, but in the final years before Flodden the average cost had inflated to 43/- a wall and £26 a hundred respectively. The high cost of commodities imported from Flanders was reflected in the size of bills for the purchase of tackle and rigging which cost between 9/10 and 10/2 in Flemish coin a hundred 'pund wecht', sails, for a bolt of 'poldavis' (a type of canvas used for making sails) cost 12/6 Flemish while iron gun stones were purchased at 6/1 Flemish for every hundred pounds. Copper was an expensive item at 25/- in Flemish groats for every hundred pounds whereas Cornwall tin amounted to 58/10 for the same measure.[248] The combined cost of purchase and workmanship often resulted in heavy

---

246. TA, i, iv.

247. ER, v, 606. TA, i, 249, 287, 284-5, 291-2, 299, iv, 286, 288, 260. A 'wall' was equal to 12 stones.

248. TA, iv, 301-3.

expenditure, for, on 23 May 1511, William Brownhill transported 20,000 lbs. of cordage from Flanders to Leith and he received £100 in Flemish coin or £295 Scots from Jerome Fiescobaldi to pay for the delivery, which broken down, amounted to 9/10 in groats for each hundred pounds and £4-18-4 for 'making' each thousand pounds.[249] The total cost of 316 stones of metal for artillery for the navy totalled £342-11/-.[250]

Secondly, £5,570 was allowed to the treasurer for the wages and fees of sailors, wrights, gunners and skippers engaged in the preparation and provisioning of the fleet. Apart from the regular contributions to sailors, wrights and skippers, already considered above, other temporarily in the king's employment were also in receipt of cash from the treasurer. On 25 September 1511 James Bymane, labourer, was paid £10 for four months wages 'quhilkis he wantis in the zeir of God 1511.... Schir Walter Ramsay and his bukis beand examinit theirone'.[251] Other items of expenditure during the year in question included the building of two galleys in Glasgow and Ayr [252] and the cost of diplomatic missions to and from France. Concerning the latter, £250 was paid to George Halkerstone in Dieppe for the transportation and expenses of de la Motte and Master James Ogilvy on a diplomatic mission to France.[253]

During the final year before the encounter at Flodden, James spent further large sums of money on naval preparations. The appendix to the fourth volume of the Exchequer Rolls described the nature of the expenditure in the minutest detail. However, as in the previous year, a substantial proportion of the expenditure was consumed by wages, the purchase of supplies and materials, and the cost of transportation. Large quantities

---

249. TA, iv, 303.
250. TA, iv, 305.
251. TA, iv, 285.
252. TA, iv, 290, 292.
253. TA, iv, 292.

of provisions were accumulated in July 1513 in preparation for the departure of the fleet. 'For the greit schippis provisioun to seywart' there occured a series of entries listing the various purchases: 29 tons of wine, 24 lsts, 16 barrels of ale costing £321-12/-, 14 lasts, 6 barrels of 'beir' costing £134-17/-, 10,000 biscuits, 10,000 loaves of sour bread, 4,700 loaves of white bread, 3 barrels of flour, 5 chalders, 9 bolls, 1 firlot of oatmeal, 4 lbs. of pepper, ½ lb. of saffron, 200 salted marts, 40 fresh marts, 40 swine, 1000 dried cod, 5,300 stockfish, 13 barrels of salmon, 5 lats of herring, 12 barrels of great salt, 8 chalders of small salt, 600 eggs, 916 large cheeses, 1 barrel of honey, 1 barrel of 'Pellok' (apparently salted porpoise), 4 barrels of candle, 4 barrels of butter, and finally 16 pipes, 24 'puncheons' of fresh water, and on the day when the 'greit schip salit', 20 fresh muttons and 4 fresh marts were requisitioned. In addition there was a large amount of kettles, pots, plates, pans, scales and ladles.[254] A substantial quantity of the food mentioned above was purchased at a variety of places by the treasurer or by the master of work, sir Walter Ramsey, but a certain proportion was derived either from the comptroller, purchased by himself or others like Robert Moncur and Martin Hunter in his name, or, as in the case of the wine 'that com fra the west sey', it was probably paid for directly at the time of purchase in France.[255] Also supplies were derived from the king's own larder for the salt marts and pepper were described as the 'kingis'.[256] Smaller vessels were similarly furnished in proportion to their size. With the demand for such large quantities of supplies, it is possible that the abuse of purveyance, 'takyn of vitaile to youre Household, and other thinges in your siad Reaune and noght paied fore', extremely common in fourteenth

---

254. TA, iv, 487-90. Ships biscuit was made from half wheat and half rye. 29 tuns of wine was calculated roughly as 7,250 gallons.
255. TA, iv, 398, 487, 489, 491.
256. TA, iv, 488.

and fifteenth centuary England, was also in operation in Scotland.[257] The evidence is meagre and often misleading as there are several entries which state the nature of the item supplied but neither the origin nor the cost.[258] In addition, certain persons seem to have gifted supplies to facilitate the provisioning of the royal fleet, for 1000 'corf keling' or dried cod 'was gevin be my lord Secretary' with no bill recorded but there is no indication whether the gift was voluntary or forced. With the demand for supplies so pressing during the summer of 1513, it seems probable that quantities of provisions were acquired on the promise of future payment or at a reduced cost. Even where a figure was associated with a particular entry, there was in fact no guarantee that payment had actually been paid out by the treasurer to the supplier. Although there was great emphasis placed on biscuit, 'sour bread' and salted meat, nevertheless it would appear that baking was done on board and there was considerable variety in the provisions supplied.[259] However, the total cost of provisioning the 'Great Michael' for her voyage to France in July 1513 amounted to over £1,550. The cost of the purchase of raw materials, the provision of victuals, fees and wages for the entire fleet amounted to £397 in March 1513 (a figure which excluded an entry of £330 for the purchase of the bark of 'Aberfeld') but the entire preparations for the July exodus totalled over £3,000.[260] In conclusion, it would appear that at least £10,000 was spent during the year 1512-3 for the wages of sailors, wrights and gunners, the expense of provisioning the vessels, the cost of raw materials and manufactured articles and expenditure on artillery.[261] However, since some entries contain no totals and since others were

---

257. Wolffe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 126.
258. TA, iv, 495, 498, 499, 500.
259. TA, iv, 488. 14/- was paid to baxters for clay for the construction of an oven.
260. TA, iv, 472-5, 501.
261. TA, iv, 451, 507.

allowed in the comptroller's account, it is likely that the total for the twelve months preparation exceeded that figure. Although it is possible to determine the contribution made by the treasurer to naval expenditure from the allowances recorded in his discharge, but it is more than likely that this did not amount to the entire spending on this venture, especially during the years immediately before Flodden. Inroads were probably made into the king's private fortune while, in common with military preparations in Mediaeval England, recourse was probably made to advances from both natives and foreign financiers, although there is no concrete evidence of such arrangements. Many royal suppliers may well have suffered from the inability of the crown to meet their bills and there is every reason to believe that the stock of provisions was augmented by purveyance. In the final years of the reign, James IV probably probed all the available avenues for additional funds, for instance, tax contributions were ordered,[262] the mine at Crawfordmure was exploited to find a new supply of gold and silver [263] and in May 1513 £433 was expended by the treasurer for the purchase of gold and silver for the king.[264]

There can be little doubt that James IV put considerable strain on the resources of the treasurer with his excessive spending on his naval programme. Before 1500 money expended by the treasurer on shipbuilding tended to be of a modest nature, but after that date the situation seems to have snowballed to an extent neither forseen nor understood by James. Between 1502 and 1507 a total of £17,500 was expended by the treasurer on shipping, mostly on the construction of the 'Margaret', but also on the purchase of supplies, the cost of provisioning vessels travelling on the king's business and the purchase of naval craft from native and foreign sources. In the year 1507 the construction of the 'Great Michael' was

---

262. TA, iv, 374, 391-6, 401.
263. TA, iv, 273-4, 396, 408.
264. TA, iv, 410.

probably initiated in earnest and during the twelve months from September 1507 and August 1508 almost £4,000 was allowed to the treasurer for the building. Although there is no reliable guide as to the actual cost of the 'Great Michael'. Although Pitscottie's figure of £30,000 was probably a slight exaggeration, is is clear that the vessel, designed to be the envy of Europe, ran away with more revenue than James had estimated in a similar vein to the Anglo-French Concorde. However, during the two years prior to the invasion of England it is not an exaggeration to suggest that the cost of the hasty preparation of the royal fleet for active duty amounted to over £25,000. It would appear that £14,700 was absorbed by the treasurer in 1512, but in the following year the treasurer's charge totalled only £21,500 of which nearly £7,500 was immediately allowed for the overexpenditure of the previous account, and only £3,100 was allowed in the discharge for naval expenditure. The total expenditure for the year, as detailed in the appendix of the fourth volume of the Treasurer's Accounts totalled around £10,000 and it is obvious that the balance was derived from outside sources.[265]

Concerning the actual size of the king's fleet the evidence is far from unanimous. In a letter from lord Dacre to Henry VIII on 24 February 1512-3 the author stated that in Leith haven there were thirteen great ships of three tops, ten small ships and the ship of Lynn captured by William Brownhill, while at New Haven there were docked two great ships, the 'Margaret' and the 'James', both being repaired.[266] In contrast, on 13 April, Dr. Nicholas West, in his letter to Henry VIII, reviewed the king's fleet as consisting of only nine or ten small topmen with other small balingers and crayers with only one topmen was rigged for war and at New Haven, he discovered the 'Margaret' with many men working setting

---

265. See Appendix No. . The total of £10,000 does not however include the supplies purchased from the comptroller's account nor those extracted from the king's larder.

266. Letters of James IV, Scot. Hist. Soc., 293.

267. Ibid, 321. 'Balingers' and 'Crayers' were small sea-going trading vessels.

up thr main mast and caulking her above the waterline.[267] However, according to the list of vessels which received large quantities of provisions in July 1513 it would appear that either the size of the fleet had been overestimated or else additional ships were furnished from sources other than the treasurers' accounts. Of the known vessels provisioned during the month of July, only three, the 'Great Michael', the 'Margaret' and the 'James' could be termed 'great ships' and even they tended to be hastily provisioned, undergunned and lacking a full crew. Concerning the latter point, Pitscottie maintained that the 'Great Michael' had a complement of 300 sailors and wrights, 120 gunners, 1000 men of was, skippers, captains and quartermasters.[268] Although this statement was probably an overestimation, it does appear that when she set sail in July 1513, 200 sailors and wrights were contracted by the crown alongwith 45 sailors, 3 pilots and 2 gunners provided by Monsieur de la Motte without wages.[269] Both the 'Margaret' and the 'James' enlisted crews of a hundred men each,[270] The remainder of the vessels victualled during this period were termed as bark, 'the bark of Abbeyfeild', (60 sailors), 'the Spanish bark' (40 sailors), 'Chalmer's bark' (60 sailors), 'John Barton's bark' (40 sailors) the 'Mytoune' under captain James Douglas (130 sailors), 'Brownhill's ship' (40 sailors) and the 'Mary' and 'Crown'.[271] Most of these were not designed as military vessels like the 'Great Michael', but fairly small trading vessels, mostly privately owned, which were requisitioned by the crown to augment the fleet. Also is seems fairly obvious that the fleet was prepared for action only at the last minute and with considerable haste and confusion.[272]

---

268. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, i, 251-2.

269. TA, iv, 485, 487.

270. TA, iv, 490, 493.

271. TA, iv, 495, 497, 498, 499, 500-1. Wages and provisions to sailors and wrights in these vessels for 40 days.

272. TA, iv, 414. The enlistment of sailors from the Lothians had to be postponed for a week on the 24 June.

Despite the vast sums of money expended by the crown on shipping, the actual involvment of the fleet in 1513 was both ill conceived and ignominiously ineffectual. Under the terms of agreement with Louis Xii, James IV was to receive financial and military aid from France only when his fleet had reached French waters to combine with the fleets from France and Denmark.[273] The number of vessel that sailed for France on 25 July 1513 is uncertain, but under the command of the inexpert earl of Arran, they were diverted to plunder the town of Carrickfergus in Ireland and in early November the fleet returned to Scotland without contributing anything to the hostilities with England.[274] What was more serious was that the 'Great Michael', the 'Margaret' and the 'James' remained in France and, in April 1514, were finally purchased by Louis XII for a sum of 40,000 francs, a poor return for the expense paid out by the Scottish treasury for the construction and maintenance of these vessels.[275] Although it is easy to be censorious over James's preoccupation with the creation of a strong navy when other countries on the Atlantic seaboard retained sizable fleets, However, he can be criticised not only for permitting the expense of these vessels to get out of hand and more especially for allowing the fleet to pass out of his control during the crisis of 1513 in return for vague promises from the king of France.

Since any royal army could be raised for a period of at most forty days and was bound to provide its own equipment and provisions, the principal cost of a military expedition during the later middle ages centred on the purchase and transportation of artillery. In the mid fourteenth

---

273. Flodden Papers, Scot. Hist. Soc., 66-72.

274. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, i, 256.

275. Flodden Papers, Scot. Hist. Soc., 113.

century considerable advances were made in the effectiveness of firearms and both James I and II recorded purchases in the fifteenth century. Bower stated that in 1430 James I purchased a great brass bombard from Flanders, called the 'lion', and it is likely that this cannon was part of the consignment for which John Turing paid £590-8-2 in Flemish groats to Nicholas Plummer to reimburse the various craftsmen working on the construction of bombards and other instruments of war.[276] The introduction of these large bombards or cannons into Scotland during the early fifteenth century and the fact that the high cost both of their purchase and their transportation tended to make them the prorogative of the monarchy, being outwith the financial reach of even the most powerful magnate, seems to have assisted the crown in its struggle against the powerful noble families of Scotland. The employment, or even the threat of the bombard, facilitated the surrender of several noble houses or castles. In 1452 a bombard was used at the seige of Hatton House in Midlothian,[277] again in 1455 at the seige of Abercorn Castle where it was stated that a French gunner 'schot richt weill and falyeit na schot within a faldome quhar it was chargit him to hit,[278] and in the 1456 account of the chamberlain of Galloway, £81 was allowed in the discharge for the carriage of the great bombard to the seige of the castle of Threave for the expenses at the actual seige and for its return to Linlithgow.[279] In al probability, it was during the reign of James II that the famous bombard 'Mons Meg' was

---

276. ER, iv, 677-9. Payment by John Turing, whose account was rendered in 1436 also included the cost of the transportation of these military engines from Flanders to Scotland. John Halewatter, a ship's captain, claimed that he was due £186 in Flemish groats as payment for a contract to transport these engines, but they had been sent in another vessel, but later in the account, he received £20 in groats for the freight of other military engines and £13-6-8 for customs payments.

277. ER, v, 606. Over £48 was spent on the bombard at the seige, supervised by Alexander Napier as master of work.

278. Auchinlek Chronicle, 53, 54.

279. ER, vi, 200, 202.

purchased in Flanders, but there is no record of its cost.[280] Apart from the reference to expenditure on artillery in the 1474 account of the treasurer,[281] it would appear that James III invested in the provision of ordnance. On 17 March 1482-3 the lords Auditors decreed that Willian Turing was to pay Paskin Laris, as procurator for his brother Copin, and William Rinde, burgess of Edinburgh, for the supply of 60 walls and 6 walls, 4 stone of iron respectively for the king's use and since lord Cathcart, master of the artillery, had received the iron in question, the latter was to be held ultimately responsible for the debt.[282] However, considerable expense appears to have been sustained on the king's artillery while under the control of lord Cathcart. On 2 March 1502-3 the lords of the council heard a complaint by John, lord Cathcart that his grandfather, as master of the artillery under James III, had subsidised royal spending on cannon and firearms from his own pocket and having made his account before the lords of the council and the auditors of the exchequer, it was found that £526-8/- remained outstanding.[283] In addition, in 1483 George Robinson, custumar of Edinburgh, was allowed the sum of £214-4/- for the making of the serpentines and guns.[284] It would appear that the 'gun callit Duchal' brought a speedy end to the resistance of the rebels in Dumbarton Castle in December 1489.[285] The king's artillery was also employed in the seige of Carneburgh Castle in 1502-4 since it was recorded that Robert Herwort and Hans both gunners, accompanied the expedition under the earl of Huntly.[286] The raid on Norham castle in the summer of 1497

---

280. This cannon was forged in the early fifteenth century in Flanders and modelled on the Ghent bombard 'Mad Marjory'. Of a total length of 13 ft 4 ins. and capable projecting an iron missile 1408 yards and a stone one 2867 yards.

281. TA, i, 74.

282. ADC, ii, cxv.

283. ADC, xiii, f 70. Paul, quoting Spottiswood's 'Practicks', maintained that Alan, lord Cathcart was appointed master of the king's artillery in 1485, but it is clear from the above reference that he held that office before March 1482-3. Paul, The Scots Peerage, ii, 508.

284. ER, ix, 219.
285. TA, i, 123, 126.
286. TA, ii, 416, 428-9, 434-5.

revealed the cost of preparing these cannons for action and also the expense of hauling these large bombards over long distances. From the accounts of the treasurer spanning the year in question, a total of over £1,800 was expended on the preparation and transportation of the king's artillery. Responsibility for furnishing the artillery and supervising its saft journey to the seige fell on Master Rober Ker, master of work, who was paid a fee of 100 marks annually.[287] 'Mons Meg', the principal bombard owned by the crown accompanied the expedition. Some ideas of the scale of the undertaking may be demonstrated by the fact that on 19 July, 221 men with spades, shovels, pikes and mattocks, at 6/- a week for each man, 187 horses and 110 drivers at 7/- a week for each horse and man, 61 quarrymen and masons at 9/4 a week, 12 wrights and a cooper in charge of the powder, also at 9/4 a week, 4 smiths, gunners and man to drive the oxen were all hired by the master of work for the expedition. The total cost of the hire of man and horses for an entire week amounted to £215.[288] Apart from the artillery which was carried from Edinburgh castle to arm the king's fleet, considerable expense was incurred by the crown in preparing bombards and other smaller ordnance to accompany the army during the proposed invasion of England in the summer of 1513. Between the 19 March 1512-3 and August 1513, a total of £1,939 was expended on the congregation and transportation of artillery.[289] This figure included the expense of wages and the purchase of supplies for the preparatory work performed by smiths, gunners and other workment in the arsenal at Edinburgh castle, the cost of the arraige of the artillery from the castle to Flodden battlefield and other miscellaneous expenses incurred during the five months.[290] Again it seems that Pitscottie can be accused of gross exaggeration, for he related that

---

287. TA, i, 339.
288. TA, i, 346-7.
289. TA, iv, 522.
290. TA, iv, 508-22.

100,000 men accompanied James IV into England in 1513 and that thirty large guns and the same number of 'field pieces' were employed, but, according to the artillery expenditure in the appendix to the fourth volume of Accounts of the Treasurer for the period immediately prior to the battle, only five large cannon, two 'gros culverins', four 'Culverins pikmoyane' and six 'culverins moyane' wer transported south from Edinburgh castle.[291] Despite the meticulous and costly preparations, the artillery, in common with the king's fleet, failed to exert any determining influence on the final battle. Although reports are varied, it would seem that the Scottish artillery was either outgunned and outmanoeuvred by its English counterpart or else rendered ineffectual by the ineptitude of those in command. Whatever the reason, there can be little doubt that king's ordnance was hastily abandoned after the battle and subsequently transported south by the victorious English army.[292]

During the fifteenth century a large proportion of the ordnance employed by the Scottish crown had been purchased in Flanders and even in the early sixteenth century with the upsurge of interest in the native construction of cannons and firearms, imports from the Low Countries still continued. On 26 October 1511 George Paterson of Leith received £12 from the treasurer to over the freight charges of certain guns with their furnishings from Flanders, while in December of the same year, William Brownhill imported six 'bemys culveringis of divers sortis' at a cost of £10-11-6.[293] In the early part of the reign of James III some 'guns' appear to have been made in Scotland,[294] but serious interest in the construction of ordnance In Scotland tended to be confined to the final six years of James IV's reign.

---

291. TA, iv, 508-22

292. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, i, 273, Mackie, King James IV of Scotland, 269.

293. TA, iv, 286, 301.

294. TA, i, 48, 68.

Manufacture was restricted to Edinburgh and Stirling castles.[295] On 10 March 1507-8 Alexander Bow, a potter in Edinburgh, received £5 to purchase metal 'to cast the first gun with' and on 9 July 1508 Alan Cochran, armourer, was sent to buy tin for the casting of certain guns.[296] However, these early attampts at gun making were probably fairly amateurish and confined to small firearms. It seems fairly clear that in the years before Flodden most of the king's artillery tended to be concentrated in Edinburgh castle,ready for use at the king's command. Carters were frequently employed transporting artillery from the castle to furnish the navy.[297] On 21 June £45 was expended by the treasurer to the carters of Leith 'to feche twa gret gunnis out of the Treiff' with ten carts, for which they were paid 9/- a day for every cart employed.[298] However, from 1511 to 1513 there is a flodd of evidence concerning large scale expenditure on gun making at the arsenal at Edinburgh castle. At the Edinburgh foundry ordnance of varying sixes and dimensions were formed from the heavy bombards to the light, often hand operated, culverings and serpentines. On 6 August 1511 Thomas Kincaid received £86-6/- for 1819½ lbs of brass for the casting of a great cannon called 'the necar'.[299]

During these two years, the treasurer spent considerable sums of money purchasing tin, iron, brass, copper and other metals in Flanders, and to a lesser extent in France, for the construction of these weapons.[300] In addition, although stone cannon balls were a cheaper form of ammunition the treasurers' accounts recorded the purchase of iron missiles; in 1512 William Brownhill was paid £169-5/- for the freight of 18,115½ lbs. 'wecht in gune stanis of irne' and on 23 May, John Balzard's bark transported from Flanders to Leith 436 pieces of iron missiles, each weighing 36 lbs. for

---

295. TA, iv, 111, 259, 276-9.
296. TA, iv, 105, 133.
297. TA, iv, 451, 454.
298. TA, iv, 350.
299. TA, iv, 278-9.
300. TA, iv, 278, 279, 302, 508-14

the cannons and 203 pieces of missiles, each weighing 16 lbs for the 'grose culveryngis', the total cost of which amounted to £169-5/-.[301] The appendix to the fourth volume of the Treasurers' Accounts listed a variety of other items purchased for the artillery, including coal and charcoal for the furnaces, wire and nails to bind the various parts of the guns, wax, butter, tallow and oil to lubricate the machine and wood for gunstocks.[302]

As mentioned above, the movement of artillery from one place to another was a laborious and expensive business. In August 1513 the cost of the carriage of the seventeen pieces of artillery, smaller firearms, missiles and powder amounted to £758-16-10.[303] The cost of the transporting each piece of ordnance was obviously related to the size of instrument involved, for instance the large cannon usually required thirty six oxen with eight to nine drivers and about twenty men with shovels, spades and pikes, whereas a 'culvering moyane' was carried with the assistance of only eight oxen.[304] The cost of the carriage of the larger cannons was around £36 whereas latter ordnance was transported at the expense of only £11. The oxen normally supplied by th king, either through purchase by the master of work or those kept permanently at Edinburgh castle for that purpose, but in 1513 oxen seems to have been hired from the lairds of Dalhousie and Lochleven, Andrew Ayton, Robert Arnot the laird of Duns, the prior of New Abbey and many others 'en route' to England.[305] The drivers for the oxen tended to receive wages at two distinct rates, 1/- a day each for fourteen days they were still in Scotland, and 1/4 a day each for the eight days labour in England.[306] In

---

301. TA, iv, 279, 303.

302. TA, iv, 508-14.

303. TA, iv, 515-20.

304. TA, iv, 515, 518.

305. TA, iv, 515-9. 143 Oxen were purchased for this purpose by the master of work and the king's butcher at Dunblane for £208. The first cannon was drawn by 'the captane of the castellis oxin'.

306. TA, iv, 517.

addition horse drawn carts were hired for the carriage of ammunition, powder and other items essential to the working of the artillery. From the evidence available the carriage of the king's artillery from Edinburgh castle to the field at Flodden was a laborious and dangerous venture over roads and paths unsuited for such weighty loads. According to the payments received by workmen accompanying the artillery the expedition seems to have taken at least twenty two days to reach its destination. Also the venture had its risks, for an ox was purchased at Dalkeith to replace the one 'that ane cannon ran our and brak his neck'.[307] Also in July 1513 the Irish chieftain O'Donell was present in Scotland and received a cannon and a culverin from James IV presumably to create a diversion in Ireland. At a cost of £155 these ordnance, accompanied by eight barrels of powder, gunstones, wrights, smiths, workmen and even eight quarriers 'for undirmynding of wallis' travelled to Glasgow. The artillery never reached Ireland as intended since on 14 August a further £47 was expended for the hire of carts to transport the cannon and equipment back to Edinburgh, representing a total waste of £200.[308]

As with the navy, the artillery at Flodden was under the command of one of the king's favourites, Henry, lord St.Clair, who was in receipt of a fee of £100 annually. The effective supervision of the royal artillery was undoubtedly exercised by Robert Borthwick, 'master melter of the king's guns', who acted as overseer of the gun casting at Edinburgh castle, and who direct the transportation of the king's artillery to Flodden.[309] In 1512 Robert Borthwick received a monthly pension of £7-10/- for himself, £4-4/- each for five of his servants, and £2-2/- for the remaining one.[310]

---

307. TA, iv, 519.

308. TA, iv, 527.

309. TA, iv, 508-522. In addition, Robert Borthwick gained a wide reputation for the casting of artillery, especially the 'Seven Sisters'. The Scottish Castle, 208, 209.

310. TA, iv, 442.

Under Borthwick there was a large complement of Scottish and Continental smiths, gunners, wrights, masons, artifers and workment. Although Scottish craftsment were employed, the lack of native skill and experience forced James to import the services of aliens, mainly from Flanders and France. On 31 January 1511-12 drinksilver was given to both Scottish and Dutch smiths and in 1512 fees were paid to Gervais, a French gunner, George Keppin, a smith in Edinburgh castle, at £7-14/- for himself and his servant, and to Wolf Urnebrig, 'that makis the gun powder in the castell of Edinburgh, at £4-4/- a month.[311] In constrast, Scottish wrights and smiths tended to be paid between 5/- and 18/- a week according to their abilities.[312] Foreign gunners included Hans, Hendrik, George the Almane and John Veilnaif. Also Borthwick hired ordinary workmen to perform the more menial tasks, normally at the rate of 8d a day. On 21 May 1513 twenty workmen were contracted by Borthwick 'for the dictand the gunnys and the clenyeand thame, four with the smythis, thre in the pouder myll' for six days.[313]

The treasurer was responsible for the expenses of both royal messengers within the realm of Scotland and also of diplomatic missions to and from Scotland. Allowances to messengers delivering royal letters and writs of summons tended to fluctuate considerably, but seemed to have been at least partly dependant on the distance travelled by the courier. Royal messengers were dispatched on a variety of missions, in 1511, for instance, 30/- was allowed to James Wallace 'for expens maid be him at the inbringing of certaine restis of Abirdene, Banff, Elgin and Fores' while a few days later a total of £3-9/- was paid to John Adamson, James Hamilton and Duncan Richie who were sent with eleven, eight and six letters respectively to warn the spiritual lords of a forthcoming general council concerning the Pope and the king of France.[314]

---

311. TA, iv, 329, 439, 440.
312. TA, iv , 513.
313. TA, iv, 510.

The internal movement of royal letters normally involved little cost to the treasurer, but communication with foreign courts frequently involved high expenditure. Between 1502 and 1508 the treasurer was allowed a total of £4,527 for diplomatic expenses, and during the year 1511-12 £1,433 was expended in this manner.[315] In fifteenth century Europe ambassadors were usually paid a modest dialy stipend and in addition were allowed the ordinary expenses of their journey and indemnity for any losses incurred during the mission. Having presented their credentials at the foreign court, it was customary for the receiving government to sustain the ordinary living expenses of the ambassadors and their retinue.[316] From the evidence available, it would appear that Scotland also adopted these arrangements in the diplomatic field. Most entries revealed a frustrating lack of detail, but it seems likely that the lump payments allowed to departing Scottish ambassadors in fact included both fees and expenses. Little insight is given into the rate of expense allowances, but on 20 April 1512 the Marchmond herald received £48-12/- for eighty days expenses on the king's business in France, 'estimat in his passage to his remanyng and returnyng, ile iii dais, ii Franch crounis of wecht'.[317] It seems to have been common practice to grant the ambassador his allowance before his departure, since on 27 September 1511 sir John Sinclair of Driden received £21 'to pas in Ingland'.[318] However, on 12 October 1501 the Lion Herald received an advance allowance of £18 to travel to England on the king's business, and on his return, he was paid a further £8-8/-,[319] probably since the earlier payment had proved inadequate. Allowances to ambassadors tended to fluctuate according to the distance involved, the

---

315. See Appendix No.
316. Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy, 35.
317. TA, iv, 341.
318. TA, ii, 12.
319. TA, ii, 122, 132.

duration of the embassy and the status of the person sent. Ambassadors sent to England rarely received over £30 for each mission, whereas in 1502 both Master Robert Cockburn and sir Alexander Bruce were granted £70 to travel to France, and on 26 April 1505 £300 was submitted to the abbot of Dunfermline 'quhen he passit to Rome for erandis of the Kingis'.[320] For normal diplomatic communication, it was customary to send a herald or pursuivant, who were appointed for life and were in receipt of an annual pension. Besides receiving a lump allowance for the mission, it was not unusual for heralds and pursuivants to receive extra payments for additional expenses. For instance, on 7 September 1501 the treasurer was allowed £4-4/- for 6 ells of double tarter to make 'tua cote armouris to Lioun herald agane his passage in Ingland' and in March 1502-3 the same herald received 200 French crowns (£140) for his expenses travelling to Rome for the confirmation of the English truce and a further £10 to purchase a horse to ride to Rome.[321] At the same time the Bute Pursuivant was donated £4-3-6 to purchase for himslef a coat, a 'jak' and boots in order to accompany the Lion Heraldn to England.[322]

Although the cost of small diplomatic mission tended to be sustained by the treasurer, large, formal embassies tended to require the granting of a tax. In January 1467-8, £3,000 was to be raised, especially those connected with marriage negotiations, from the three estates for the cost of an embassy of a prelate, lord, knight or clerk and forty 'honourable and worshipable persons' sent to Denmark to negotiate the king's marriage.[323]

---

320. TA, ii, 104, 114, 121, 122, 138, 159, 244. There appears to have been a standard rate for embassies to France, for many allowances amounted to £70 or 100 French crowns.

321. TA, ii, 118, 361-2.

322. TA, ii, 362. The Lion herald would have passed through England on his way to the continent.

323. APS, ii, 90.

According to customary procedure, it was the duty of the crown, through the comptroller [324] and treasurer, to sustain the everyday cost of visiting embassies. On 7 July 1512 the treasurer submitted £20-2-7 to the wife of Gelis Fisher for the expense of the upkeep of de la Motte and his servants 'in met, drink and utheris necessaris, efter his compt of his dietis gewyn thairone' from 18 June to 11 July.[325] On his previous visit to Scotland in March of the same year, he was lodged at the dwelling of Paul Galbraith, the queen's servant, for ten days at a cost of £17-15-10.[326] In addition, the host country was responsible for the transportation of a visiting ambassador out of the country. On 7 July 1512 David Falconer received 100 French crowns or £70 Scots from the treasurer to convey de la Motte to France.[327] However, payments to visiting ambassadors tended to be lump payments, frequently in round figures, with little indication of the underlying motivation behind the arrangement. It seems to have been customary for these allowances to have been paid on the ambassador's departure, for on 14 April 1512 100 'crounis of wecht' or £90 Scots was delivered to an Italian who carried Papal letters to James IV 'at his returnyng' and two days later the son of the laird of Lundy, transporting letters from the king of France, received fifty 'crounis of wecht' or £45 Scots on the same occasion.[328] It was customary for the host government to present departing ambassadors with sizeable gifts. On 12 June 1511 the English ambassadors, lord Dacre and Dr. West, dean of Windsor received gifts of silver plate from James IV on their departure to England, namely 'two silvir stopis of the Kingis cupburd of the lest bynd, and ane coup callit the coup of fere, nettit with gold of florising uteweht', valued at £121-10/-.[329] Such gifts were also submitted in cash, often in

---

324. Miscellany of the Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 68, 74.

325. TA, iv, 352.

326. TA, iv, 336.

327. TA, iv, 352.

328. TA, iv, 340, 341.

329. TA, iv, 348, 533.

foreign currency. The extent of the gift seems to have depended on the status of the ambassador, foreign heralds or pursuivants usually received fairly small donations, but in March 1511-2 de la Motte 'at his departing of Scotland to France' received 200 'crounis of wecht (£180) and a purse in which to transport the coins, and similarly the Spanish ambassador 'at his leiff taking of the king' was delivered 100 'ducats of wecht' (£95).[330] The cost of donations to visiting embassies or deputations could often be extremely expensive. On 11 April 1507 the treasurer was required to present £700 or 1000 French crowns to the embassador sent by Pope Julium II with the present of a hat and sword to James IV.[331] In August 1513, £90 was paid to Octavian an Italian on his departure to France and Master James Ogilvy was in receipt of a parting payment of £127-7/- from the treasurer on the occasion of a similar journey.[332]

At periods of intense diplomatic activity, namely 1511 and 1512, the continual movement of ambassadors to and from the court increased the financial strain of the king's financial officials. Although the entertainment of political refugees could be an invaluable diplomatic counter, financially, they could prove to be an extremely expensive luxury. On 20 November 1495 James IV welcomed 'Prince Richard of England', alias Perkin Warbeck, to Scotland as the pretender to the throne of Henry VII.[333] Between the date of his arrival and July 1497 Warbeck was maintained at the Scottish court in a style befitting his pretended status. Sometime during the year 1496-7 a tex was raised to counter his expenses in Scotland since the custumers of Aberdeen submitted £20 to Andrew Wood of Blairton,

---

330. TA, iv, 335, 336.

331. TA, iii, 380. Details of the nature and motivation behind the visit, see TA, iii, LXXVIII-LXXIX.

332. TA, iv, 419. Ogilvy's expenses in Scotland amounted to £14.

333. Perkin Warbeck was promated by Margaret, dowager duchess of Burgundy and sister of the late Edward IV, as her nephew and one of the sons of Edward.

as reward for his work in the collection of the proceeds and on 10 July 1499 he received an acquittance for £500 collected as tax from the Northern half of the realm.[334] A large proportion of the daily expenses of Warbeck and his followers was sustained either by the comptroller or else directly from local Ballivi ad Extra or custumers' accounts.[335] Also, during the period of Warbeck's sojourn in Scotland, payments totalling £1,351 were allowed to the treasurer. These payments were principally £253 for the purchase of clothing for the arrival of Warbeck in November 1495,[336] £350 submitted to Rollard Robinson 'to red Inglismennis costis' in various places during his residence,[337] and £336 as three monthly payments of the annual pension of £1,200 granted to Warbeck.[338] When Warbeck was finally encouraged to leave the Scottish court in July 1497, the treasurer expended a further £186-7/- on provisioning the 'Cuckoo' which transported Warbeck, his wife and at least thirty retainers from Ayr to Cork.[339]

The expenses of the justice ayres were sustained by the treasurer, sometimes in a separate section and at other times included in the 'Bursa Regis'. The cost was normally extensive, for the expense of 117 days of ayres at various burghs between May 1505 and July 1506 amounted to £665, while expenditure on these circuit courts between October 1502 and November 1504 totalled £1,348.[340] Individual allowances varied considerably at the 1502 border ayres the justiciar received an allowance of £2 daily, the bishop of Aberdeen around £2-12/- a day, the earl of Lennox a daily payment of 30/-, the treasurer 13/4, and Master Richard Lawson 18/- for

---

334. ER, xi, 49. RSS, i, 405. The tax was delivered to comptroller sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch.

335. ER, x, 533, 576, 589, xi, 4, 15, 39, 40, 45. TA, i, cxxviii-cxxix. Miscellany of Scot. Hist. Soc., ix, 81.

336. TA, i, 264.

337. TA, i, 274, 276, 277, 280, 303.

338. TA, i, 335, 340, 342.

339. TA, i, 342-4, 345, 352.

340. TA, ii, 298-300, iii, 91-2.

for every day of attendance.[341] This branch of expenditure contained enormous selections of multifarious material too diverse to mention in detail.[342] The various items were arranged in chronological order with no attempt to divide them into catagories. The amount of cash expended on each entry varied drastically, from a few shillings to hundreds of pounds. Many of these payments were made directly from the treasurer's coffers while other submissions were made through the agency of other persons. For instance, on 15 October 1511, £4-4/- was delivered to Florimond Semple by John Forman in order that the former could purchase certain necessities.[343] On several occasions, it appears that certain persons were tardily repaid by the treasurer for purchases or services perfórmed for the king at an earlier date. A large proportion of the payments made by the treasurer under the section 'Bursa Regis' were probably dependant on the money received into his coffers and the extent and promptitude of the expenditure was undoubtedly determined by the amount of available cash. However certain larger expenses seem to have been honoured through assignation, as in the case of the £201-4/- allowed to John Mosman for a quantity of jewelry and drugs received from him for the king before 14 October 1511, which debt was cleared by an assignment of the debt and rest of the laird of Lekprevik owed to the treasurer by the earl of Eglington.[344] On account of the immense variety included in this particular section of the treasurer's expenditure, it will suffice to mention only a few of the more interesting and more valuable entries.

---

341. TA, 299. The expenses rate seem to have varied, for in October 1502, the treasurer received a daily allowance of 13/4, in May 1503, he received £1 daily, in October of the same year the allowance had risen to 30/- and by August 1504 he was receiving £2 daily for his attendance at the justice ayres. (TA, ii, 299-300). This augmentation was probably the result of the increasingly important role exercised by the treasurer at the justice aure especially in connection with the settling of compositions.

342. The introduction to the Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, i, iv, presented a fairly extensive resume of the items included.

343. TA, iv, 313.

344. TA, iv, 151, 159, 313.

In this section there was a certain amount of overlap with other parts of the treasurer's discharge, for, apart from entries relating to naval and public work programmes, it was not uncommon to discover allowances for fees and pensions which normally formed a separate section in the accounts,[345] and also for alms.[346] The money expended by the treasurer in the 'Bursa Regis' represented the daily expenses of the king during his constant itinerary round his realm. This would normally include payment for miscellaneous services performed for the king, namely 14/- was donated to certain boatmen who conveyed the king from New Haven to the ship on 27 June 1508 while in the following month, £5-2/- was given to 306 men, probably beaters, 'that wes at hunting with the king'.[347] Also, persons in the king's company or in royal service tended to receive similar allowances. In 1508 9/- was submitted for a boat to transport John Forman and Florence Auchmowty from Leith to Kinghorn on being summoned by James IV.[348]

Sundry supplies and services were constantly being recorded in this section. Purchases might include anything from cherries to gold for the king's book and even to golf balls.[349] The most common items paid for by the treasurer in this sphere were foreign spices, fruit, fish, armour and other military equipment, stalbe supplies and a variety of other items too numerous to mention. However, three commodities were worthy of further mention, not only for the extent of cash expended but also for their insight into the character and interests of James IV. Firstly, James spent large sums of money on the purchase of drugs from the continent and in frequent payments to leeches. Between February 1500-1 and the same

---

345. TA, iv, 138, 333.
346. TA, i, 290, 291, iv, 296.
347. TA, iv, 128, 137.
348. TA, iv, 130.
349. TA, ii, 178, 187, iv, 132.

month 1504-5 over £570 was allowed to the treasurer for the acquisition of drugs and in the year 1511-12 John Mosman and William Fowler received over £300 for furnishing the same commodity.[350] Leeches, mostly from Europe, were employed by James. Payments were made to the leech with curling hair, the leech with yellow hair, the Irish leech, a person called Fullerton and especially John Danian, the French leech.[351] From the evidence recorded in the accounts of the treasurer there can be little doubt that James IV retained an extremely active interest in sciene and medicine but, as in many of his other ventures, his ambition was insatiable.[352] John Damian, later promoted to the abbey of Tungland,[353] prevailed on James to establish furnaces at Edinburgh and Stirling to facilitate the search for 'quinta essentia', a substance designed to convert metal into pure gold, heal all diseases and prolong human life.[354] Despite the mishap from his attempt to fly from the ramparts of Stilring castle and his apparent dishonesty, in July 1507 50 marks was lent by the treasurer to Damian and the treasurer complained that it 'can nocht be gottin fra him'; James' confidence in Damian does not seem to have been shaken, as he was frequently in the king's presence and in receipt of royal revenue.[355] The treasurer's discharge recorded frequent allowances to John Damian for coal, drugs, wine, vinegar for the purpose of creating 'quinta essencia'.[356] In addition, during the final years of the reign of James IV, a wide variety of articles were purchased for the experitents, including 'aqua vitae' wine, silver, saltpetre, alum, 'sal ammoniac' and other 'stuff',[357] while urinals,

---

350. TA, ii, 34, 100, 148, 306, 350, 365, 416, 441, 445, 477, iv, 283, 313, 354.

351. TA, ii, 56, 97, 140, 153, 340.

352. TA, ii, lxxiii, lxxix.

353. TA, ii, 423.

354. TA, ii, lxxvii, 359, 360, 393, 365, 410.

355. TA, ii, 139, 149, iii, 406. Leslie, History of Scotland, 76. Damian seems to have frequently played cards, dice and other games with the king. TA, ii, 138, iv, 83, 89, 101, 103, 111, 112.

356. TA, ii, 144, 148, iv, 79, 108.

357. TA, iv, 77, 79, 80, 85, 96, 98, 101, 104, 137, 418.

great flasks, pipes, iron chests and pitchers were bought to serve as containers.[358] In 1512 Master Alexander Ogilvy received £214-4/- for expenditure on 'quinta essencia' for the previous year and a further £41-6-10 for drugs and workmen's wages for roughly the same period.[359] Of the king's preoccupation with alchemy, Leslie commented that the king believed that he 'wold make the fine golde of uther metall, quhilk science he callit the quintassence; quhairupon the King maid greit cost, but all in vaine'.[360]

Secondly, considerable sums of money were spent by the treasurer on the purchase and treatment of jewelry and precious metals. Mention has already been made of the hoard of jewelry, precious metals and plate amassed by James II by 1488 and inherited by his son, but the evidence suggested that James IV attempted to add to the articles already located in the royal jewelhouse.[361] For instance, in December 1511, quantities of gold and silver were purchased and delivered to John Aitken, goldsmith, to form plates and saltcellars for the royal table at a cost of £150.[362] Foreign goldsmiths like Michael from France and Jean la Rossy, also from France, were in the king's pay.[363]

Thirdly, James IV's love of sport and the hunt can be estimated by the amount of cash spent on the provision of hawks and dogs. By the number of entries in the treasurer's discharge relating to the supply of hawks for the king's use it would appear that James must have amassed a considerable collection. The accounts recorded the frequent purchase of hawks and also the fact that they varied considerably in price, in 1488

---

358. TA, iv, 83, 90, 94, 96, 102.
359. TA, iv, 282-3
360.
Leslie, History of Scotland, 76
361. TA, i, 79-87.
362. TA, iv, 321.
363. TA, iv, 398, 403.

the young king paid the exorbitant price of £180 to the earl of Angus for a single hawk and in 1504 £13 was submitted to the laird of Pardovy 'for ane halk'.[364] As well as purchasing hawks, the king increased his stock through gifts for a hawk seems to have been an extremely acceptable present the donor normally being rewarded with an allowance of 14/- [365] and also by sending royal falconers to various part of Scotland, especially the Highland areas and even to Norway and France, to capture the birds in the wild.[366] On 3 May 1513 both David and Simon, king's falconers, received allowances of £20 as their expenses for their journeys to Shetland and Orkney respectively to obtain hawks.[367] Regular payments were incurred by the treasurer to offset the cost of maintaining the king's hawks at Creigforth, Linlithgow, and Inchkeith.[368] In May 1501 Hanney, falconer and two assistants received £2-2/- for the following fifteen days wage for the keeping of the king' hawks at Inchkeith, and he continued to receive payment for that office in 1508.[369] Similarly, the accounts frequently recorded payments for the supply of both horses and dogs. Concerning the former, the royal stables were being constantly replenished through the purchase and donation of horses. The treasurer was also liable to sustain the cost of shoeing, providing saddles and numerous other items of equipment. Stable expenses for the year 1511-12 amounted to £205-14-7, a total which included the fees and expenses of John Andrew, horse marischal, whose duties ere detailed as 'to merschele and mend the Kingis hors and to wait thairone', John Sparty, smith, who was responsible for the shoeing of the king's horses, John Lichton and Thomas Burn who made saddles, bridles,

---

364. TA, i, 95, ii, 466.
365. TA, ii, 409, 428.
366. TA, ii, 106, 107, 111, 149, 371, 431, 474, i, 332.
367. TA, iv, 410.
368. TA, ii, 106, 107, 108.
369. TA, iv, 115.

reins, harnesses, sword belts and other stuff relating to their craft as saddlers, William Dalgleigh, lorimer, who was responsible for mending stable equipment and providing spurs, and finally James Avery for supervising 102 carriage horses, employed for transporting the queen, her court and her belongings from place to place, all based on bills presented by each of the above.[370] Just before James IV's departure to Flodden, Sparty was paid £15 for the shoeing of the king's great horse 'as his bills bens'.[371] The king's 'gret hors' was probably purchased in Flanders by Patrick Halibruton at the cost of at least £66-13-4 and in the following years payments were made to Robert Galloway not only for the upkeep and equipment of the horse but also for 'tua fut men that ledis the Kingis gret hors on fut' for which they received daily a wage of 8d.[372] On 18 June 1513, £40 was submitted to Alexander Gordon a yeoman of the queen's stable for a horse bought for the king.[373] Horses were employed not only for sporting purposes but more especially for the requirements of the royal household and other persons engaged in royal service. The frequent hiring and purchasing of horses for particular missions suggested that the royal stables were not sufficiently stocked to cope with the demand. Although the hiring of a horse for a short period was only a matter of a few shillings, the actual purchase involved the treasurer in bills of between £3 and 20 marks. Entries recording the purchase of horses for the king were inserted both in the Wardrobe accounts and the 'Bursa Regis'. Horses for the use of household servants and other persosn engaged on royal business were purchased at regular intervals,[374] but on 30 April 1508 £26-13-4 was allowed to the treasurer for the acquisition from a person

---

370. TA, iv, 307-8.
371. ER, iv, 418.
372. TA, ii, 197, 343, 419, 434-5, 459, 461-2, 465.
373. ER, iv, 413.
374. TA, iv, 13, 15, 20, 74, 83, 91, 97, 104, 133, 134, 138.

called Mure of 'a hors quhilk ran up the staris of the cors'.[375]

In common with hawks the royal stock of hounds was augmented both by the gift and also by purchase, for, in 1503, the treasurer received an allowance for £7 for payment made to a servant of sir Thomas Wortwales for bringing dogs from England.[376] In 1508 the cost of maintaining the king's dogs amounted to 2/- daily.[377]

Although the comptroller was normally responsible for the purchase of wine for the royal household, between October 1512 and August 1513, substantial sums of money were expended on the provision of wine. On 22 November 1512 £56 was delivered to William Stirling 'for the furnesing of one schip that past at the West Sea to Rochell for wynis', three days later a further £18 was allowed for the victualling of the ship and on 3 April 1513 Stirling was paid £62-10/- for the freight cost of 21 tons of wine which was transported to Dumbarton in a French vessel.[378] Also, on 5 February 1512-13, £220 was made over to the 'patrone of Delamotis schip that bocht in the wyne.[379]

However, some other items of expenditure by the treasurer under the heading 'Bursa Regis' are worthy of mention. In this section, daily, weekly and monthly wages were submitted to workmen and artisans whose trade tended not to be included in the other discharge sections. For instance, on 7 November 1053, an English plastered received £7-18/- for eleven weeks wages at the king's command.[380] On 20 July 1512 'the scheiphird at kepit the Franche scheip' was in receipt of a daily allowance of 8d for his

---

375. TA, iv, 21.

376. TA, ii, 405.

377. TA, iv, 129. The Bill extended for the period 1 September 1507 to 1 August 1509 and amounted to £33-10/-

378. TA, iv, 398, 408.

379. TA, iv, 405.

380. TA, ii, 405. Paid in English coin, namely 6 angle nobled and 12 groats.

expenses and also for the cost of overseeing the king's sheep and lambs from September 1511 to June the following year, at a total cost of £11-8-8 while, at the same time Ninian Silver and his servant Rumboit, embroiderers, received a combined monthly payment of 6 French crowns (4-4/- in Scots) for ten months, their months labour in the service of the bishop of Aberdeen having been deducted.[381] Also, at periodic intervals allowances were granted to the treasurer for sums quoted in bills submitted by certain craftsmen. On 19 January 1511-2 Alan Cochran, armourer, received £15-14-8 'for certane foir geir and bak geir, reformyng of uthir geir, dichtein of halbertis, for skalbertis, grathing of swerdis and other work from last April to the present date and he received a further £4-18/- for cleaning fourteen steel saddles with emery paper, at the rate of 7/- for each cleaning.[382] After the marriage of James IV, a common item of expenditure was the periodic hiring of carts to 'tursit the quenis gere' or transport the queen's wardrobe. On 21 September 1503, twenty carts, at 36/- each cart, were required to effect the carriage of her baggage from Linlithgow to Stirling.[383]

It was essential for early Rennaissance monarchs to attract a reputation for generosity, at least on the surface. The stigma of meanness undoubtedly adversely affected the position of James III and part of the attraction of James IV to contemporaries and later historians originated from his reputation for open handedness. Apart from the frequent payment of alms and ecclesiastical endowments already mentioned above, James IV persistently ordered renumeration to be paid to a wide variety of persons. Recipients of the king's generosity were both of

---

381. TA, iv, 353.

382. TA, iv, 328-9.

383. TA, ii, 396, 402, 405, 438, 459, 463. The cost seems to vary according to the distance involved.

low and high birth. Small payments were constantly being made to poor persons throughout the royal itinery and also to those who had suffered some kind of mishap, 14/- was given to a poor man whose horse had died in the king's service and a similar allowance was granted to a master cook's boy who broke his leg.[384] In addition, it was customary to give a small financial return to those who arrived at the royal court bearing gifts to the king, or to those who had performed some small service to the crown. On 26 March 1513, Master Cook was given a total of £20 'that he layd doune at diverse tymes sen Yule bypast to sindry persosn that brocht presents to the King.[385] On 11 May 1512, the treasurer submitted £4-14-4 to Master Cook for the payment of present and reward silver.[386] Loss sustained either in the king's service or by accident was frequently compensated by the treasurer, as in June 1504 when Master William Ogilvy was in receipt of £14 quhen he tynt his purs and monee'.[387] In addition, drinksilver, basinsilver, bridle silver, wedsilver, spursilver and leashsilver allowances, represented additional payments of varying amounts to persons employed on specific tasks. On festive occasions, expecially New Year's day and Easter, it was customary for the king to present gifts of money and jewalry to favoured persons. In 1507 James IV expended a total of £216-12-2 on such donations, a sum which excluded 'the gret serpent tong with all the stanes and graith tharof, with the coffir it was in' given by James to his queen. Recipients varied considerable, depending on who was present at court on that day but it was normal for the queen and several of her servants (in 1507 Mistress Barlee received a pair of gold beads valued at over £62) to benefit from the king's generosity as well as minstrals who had entertained the court during the festive season

---

384. TA, ii, 382, 421.
385. TA, iv, 407.
386. TA, iv, 345.
387. TA, ii, 441.

and other honoured persons.[388] In 1512 the Ilay herald was in receipt of 10 French crowns, 'in the name of the officiaris of armes, for their crying larges one New Yeir day, deliverit eftir the auld ricurand use'.[389] Foreign visitors to the Scottish court, excluding those on official embassy, were generously treated by the king. During the reign of James IV foreign visitors were encouraged to visit the court and few must have left empty handed. In 1488 and early 1489, the treasurer sustained the cost of maintaining Count Gerhard of Oldenburg, the brother of Chrisian I of Denmark. On 21 October 1488 £500 was submitted to Gerhard himself and on two occasions a total of £386-10/- was delivered to Peter Falconer, burgess of Edinburgh, for his food and lodgings.[390] On 17 January 1496-7 an allowance of £76 was recorded for the expenses of his second visit to Scotland.[391] In 1491 £50 was paid to sir George Nevall, and Englich knight, banished from his native land, in 1502 £14 was donated to the earl of Greece while in 1513 the visit of the Irish chieftain O'Donell to Scotland cost the treasurer £90 for his maintenance and £160 as his departing gift.[392] Foreign knights were not uncommon visitors to tournaments in Scotland, for the accounts recordēd the preparations for the 'Fechting of the Lord Hamiltoun and the Franch knight', the latter sir Anthony D'Arcy or Sieur de la Bastie from Dauphigny, was renouned in Eruope for his military exploits.[393] In reward for his activities in Scotland, the treasurer was ordered to sustain the cost of his lodgings for his eighteen weeks, at 24/- each week, the expense of his servants clothing, and his departing gift of 400 French

---

388. TA, iii, 359-60.

389. TA, iv, 325.

390. TA, i, 97, 103, 106.

391. TA, i, 310.

392. TA, i, 176, ii, 147, iv, 416, 527. There is no indication who the earl of Greece actually was.

393. TA, ii, 352.

crowns, paid over in English coin (£280 in Scots), Flemish silver plate valued at £150 and other silverware which belonged to the king.[394]

The cost of hiring foreign mercenaries does not figure strongly in the treasurer's accounts, although in the few months before Flodden a total of £47-18-8 was paid to 'the lenycht of Spanse that beris the axe on his Creste' of which £20 was specified as 'byrun wagis'.[395] Royal generosity also benefitted those resident in Scotland. On 21 February 1506-7, £90 was received by the lady who brought the new of the birth of the prince to the king.[396] James IV also seems to have lent aid to those in royal favour. In 1407 the treasurer advanced £10 to Alexander Kers, cook, to facilitate the building of his house whereas in 1504, £13-6-8 was received by William Spicehouse to aid his purchase of five marks worth of land.[397] On 30 April 1512 the treasurer, by the king's special command and on the production of two royal precepts, delivered £666-13-4 to Adam, earl of Bothwell to redeem his lands of Petcox, which payment may well have been in the form of a loan by the crown.[398]

The treasurer was also called upon to offset the expense of James' various other pursuits, designed to bring him into line with other Rennaissance princes. As such, James was expected to fulfil the role of

---

394. TA, iii, 364, 365, 366. The total cost to the treasurer amounted to over £486 not counting the king's personal silverware.

395. TA, iv, 398.

396. TA, iii, 369.

397. TA, ii, 441, iii, 380.

398. TA, iv, 346. The lands of Petcox, situated within the earldom of March, had been granted to Patrick lord Hailes by James III around 1482 and seem to have continued to be occupied by that family until at least 1513. (ER, ix, 521, xiii, 559). On 27 August 1511, the lands in question were included in a royal confirmation to Adam, earl of Bothwell and a day later they were granted to Agnes Stewart, daughter of James, earl of Buchan, who was the wife of earl Adam. (RMS, ii, 3635, 3637.) However, there is no evidence of any further alienation of Petcox nor from whom the lands were redeemed.

patron of the arts. The treasurer's discharge contained many examples of large pensions and gifts being presented to foreign craftsmen,[399] Italian and French minstrals,[400] and continental leeches, goldsmiths, gardiners and plasterers.[401] James IV was eagre to establish continental influences in Scotland. In January 1503-4 John Damian, the French leech, received over £54 for costumes and other expenses for the traditional Twelfth Night dances.[402] In December 1513 £9 was paid to Monsieur de la Motte's servants 'that dansit ane moris to the King'.[403] Men of literary and artistic talents tended to receive fairly substantial renumerations, the poet William Dunbar received an annual annuity of £10, raised to £20 and ultimately to £80 by 1511.[404] Piers the painter from Holland received £12-12/- to provide for his journey to Scotland, a further £5-16/- on his arrival and during his stay he was allowed a pension of £2-16/- a month with additional payments for drinksilver and equipment.[405] In addition, James IV was actively engaged in amassing a library of considerable size and diversity.[406] Books were continually being purchased and dorned, as in 1503 when Andrew Millar received £10 for a quantity of well known issues and in 1508 sir Thomas Galbraith received a similar sum for 'illuminyng the Kingis evangelist buke'.[407] Until the latter part of the reign of James IV printed books had had to be imported but on 15 September 1507, James IV issued a patent to Walter Chapman and Andrew Millar, licencing them to import and print with all the necessary equipment 'for imprenting within our realme of the bukis of our lawis, actis of Parliament, cronicles, mess bukis and portuus eftir the use of our realme, with additiouns and legendis

---

399. TA, iii, 374, iv, 62, 123-7.
400. TA, iii, 68-70, 270-1, iv, 70, 443.
401. TA, iii, 352, 390, 439, iv, 110. 443.
402. TA, iii, 414.
403. ER, iv, 399.
404. TA, iii, 117, lv, 69, 268.
405. TA, iii, 162, 164, 325, 326, 350, 384-5, 387, 393, 402, 404.
406. For details of the books collected, TA, iii, cxii, cxiv.
407. TA, iii, 364, iv, 41.

qf Scottis sanctis now gaderit to be ekit thairto, and al utheris bukis that sal be sene necessare'.[408] Although there is little further information concerning the print it would appear that Walter Chapman, a leading Edinburgh burgess, was not ignored by royal patronage.[409]

James IV was well endowed with mistresses, some of which bore him children.[410] However, although such activities were normal in the courts of fifteenth and sixteenth century Europe, they often proved to be costly. The accounts recorded payments to at least three mistresses, firstly from June 1496 to her death in mysterious circumstances in 1502 a total of £535 was paid by the treasurer for the clothing and expenses of Margaret Drummond daughter of John, lord Drummond.[411] By her, often referred to as merely M.D. in the accounts, James had a daughter Margaret. The second mistress mentioned in the treasurer's accounts, Janet Kennedy, daughter of John, lord Kennedy, proved to be a more expensive and inconvenient luxury. In 1500 she bore the king a son, James, who, in 1501 was conceded the lands of the earldom of Moray along with the title of earl, the burgh farm of Elgin and Forres, the castle of Darnaway, the office of sheriff and various fishing rights inside the earldom, although, on account of his non-age, the concession remained in royal hands.[412] On the occasion of the king's marriage to Margaret Tudor in 1503, the continued presence of Janet Kennedy at court was an embarrassment, and, as a result, in 1501 and 1502 £191 was expended on the repair of Darnaway castle for her residence.[413] In addition, a further £265-7-8 was assigned from the farms

---

408. RSS, i, 1546. Andrew Millar had been a printer in France.

409. ER, xii, 373, 464, 594, 614, 644. RMS, ii, 2588, 3397, 3498. It is likely that Chapman supplied the capital for the venture.

410. Paul, The Scots Peerage, i, 22-3.

411. TA, i, 277, ii, 152. The figure was undoubtedly greater as there was a gap in the treasurer's accounts between July 1498 and January 1500-1.

412. RMS, ii, 2586, 2587. Until at least 1513, the annual rents from the earldom of Moray were collected by royal ballivi ad extra.

413. TA, ii, 47-8.

of the property of Glencairny and Abernethy between 1501 and 1504 for the construction cost of the castle of Darnaway.[414] Between January 1500-1 and February 1504-5, the treasurer was allowed a total of £1,943 for her clothing, provisions and other expenses and also for the maintenance of the young earl of Moray.[415] Finally, in 1503 and 1504 two payments totalling £47 were paid by the treasurer to L.A., whose abbreviated title hid another of James IV's mistresses.[416] During the first decade of the sixteenth century, there was a continuous series of payments to Master James Watson for the expenses of the 'bairns', to thom he apparently acted a tutor, on the king's behalf. 'The bairns' were apparently two children, James Stewart, earl of Moray the illegitimate son of James IV and Janet Kennedy, and Robert Lyle, the son of Robert, lord Lyle, who had no obvious relationship to the king but may have acted as a companion to Moray.[417] Apart from clothing allowances,[418] Watson received expenses at the rate of 8/- a day, which amounted to an annual bill of £64-16/-.[419]

During the reign of James IV, jousting was a favourite pastime. In July 1507 a tournament was held which incurred a bill of over £1,000, most of which was spent on expensive clothing for the king and other participants material for tents, around £250 was expended on banners, standards, arms and riding equipment.[420] The extravagance of the occasion can easily be demonstrated by a few selected examples; £16-3/- was expended on metal pears, leaves and flowers for the Tree of Esperance, £14 was paid to the Marchmont herald 'that fallowis for the spulze of the feild' and £88 was spent on taffety to cover the 'chair triumphal' for the black lady.[421]

---

414. ER, xii, 54, 223.

415. TA, ii, 39-48, 294-8.

416 TA, ii, 370, 432. The abbreviation L.A. like M.D. for Margaret Drummond, was a discretionary entry designed to disguise the actual identity of the person concerned.

417. It would appear that the previous lord Lyle died before March 1501-2. Paul, The Scots Peerage, v, 555.

418. TA, iii, 96, 102, 112.

419. TA, iii, 103.

420. TA, iii, 256-261, 393-7.

421. TA, iii, 260, 393, 394.

In the final years of his reign, James IV invested revenue in the developement of mining as a means of counteracting the universal dearth of metals, especially gold and silver. In the year ending August 1512, the treasurer's discharge recorded expenditure of £96-14-8 on mining, while in the following twelve months a further 165-4/- was expended.[422] Under sir James Pettigrew workmen were engaged at the rate of 6/- a day, but as in many other fields, foreign expertise was imported in the shape of Dutchman Gerard Essemur, melter, who received an allowance of £33-12/- annually and Sebald Northberg who was in receipt of an annual pension of £42.[423] Principal interest was centred on the mine at Crawfordmure but lead was being extracted from mines at Islay and Wanlockhead. Although quantities of lead were forthcoming from these mines,[424] it is doubtful if, at this early stage, any gold or silver deposites were extracted.

During the part of the fifteenth century before 1488 there is evidence of considerable European contact ald also of the crown investing in spheres typical of the Renaissance, namely building, artillery, expensive clothing and other items, but the development was limited by an overall shortage of capital. The aspirations were in evidence but the Scottish crown lacked the necessary resources. In addition, there is ample evidence from the surviving 1474 account of the treasurer and from other sources that James III did patronize learning and the arts and also sank money into the development of artillery and shipping but again his hands were bound by limited resources. In fact, James III's preoccupation with men of artistic and academic talents, his 'low class favourites' like James Hammyl, the tailer, Leonard a shoemaker, William Rogers, the musician and Robert Cochran, a master mason, proved to be one of the so called complaints of the baronage during the unrest of the 1480s. However, both

---

422. TA, iv, 273-5, 376, 396, 408, 442.
423. TA, iv, 273.
424. TA, iv, 274. Payment was made for the carriage of lead.

the 1474 treasurer's account and those of the early years of James IV suggested that restricted funds remained a permanent drawback until the effective rule of James IV. A feature of the Renaissance revival throughout Europe was its expense and James IV was the first Scottish monarch to be in a position to participate fully in its principal attractions. However, in the reign of James IV spending on these items was greatly enhansed, firstly since bothe the treasurer and the comptroller had succeeded in extracting far arger amounts of revenue from traditional sources, secondly James IV was not restricted by a lengthy minority, but finally, apart from the first few years of the reign, James IV did not have to endure any serious baronial revolt. Although annual expenditure was to a certain extent limited by the size of the income, there can be little doubt that James IV spent vast sums of money on building, shipping, expensive clothing, excessive largesse and patronage, alchemy, mistresses and their offspring, artillery and military preparations, tournaments and other sports, books and a host of other luxuries on which a Rennaissance prince was expected to invest his resources. James was eager to import not only continental materials and manufactured articles, but also to encourage the influx of foreign craftsmen and expertise. It is too easy to be censorious over such heavy spending on items like alchemy and mistresses but such activities were common pursuits in the courts of Rennaissance Europe. What is more open to criticism, however, was the manner in which the king's fleet and artillery, on which James IV spent such a vast fortune, was frittered away in 1513.

Two additional entries are worthy of note. Firstly, during the reign of James IV the treasurer appears to have supplied the king with ready money when requested. The treasurer was frequently called upon to finance the king's losses at cards or dice. Such pursuits provided the king and his immediate friends with suitable recreation in the long winter nights, especially around Chirstmas and New Year, for on 27, 28 and 30 December 1506 the treasurer made three separate payments of £70 to the

king to 'play at the cartis'.[425] Presumably the money won by the king at cards and dice was received into his own coffers, although in January 1511-2, £28 was submitted to Arthur Bruce, merchant, as recompense for the campbed, steik of Holland cloth, a box and certain merchandise won from him by the king at cards.[426] In addition, regular payments were made by the treasurer 'to the king himself in his own purse', which cash was probably designed for the king's personal use.[427] Such an arrangement also relieved the treasurer of constant attendance on the king. In the final year before Flodden, Robert Forman, dean of Glasgow, received sums of money bound for the royal purse. On 15 December 1512 £60 was delivered to him 'for the furnesing of the Kingis purs the tyme His Grace past to Quhiteherne'.[428] Between 1502 and 1506 the king's purse was in receipt of £1,500 while in the years 1507-8 (1512-13) payments totalled £1,202 and £1,067 respectively.[429] Between October 1512 and August 1513, £1,280 was supplied by the treasurer to the king's purse. On 6 August 1513 it was stated that £560 had been given to the king in his closet in the month of July, paid in ridars, unicorns and other gold coins, of the first 1,000 marks contributed by the Laird of Lochinver.[430] Secondly, on certain occasions, it was found necessary for treasurer to lend financial assistance to the comptroller to offset the huge deficit which frequently occurred in the latter's account.[431] The sums of money involved were considerable during the worse periods of insolvency on the part of the comptroller, as between 1502 and 1508 when a total of £24,525 was transferred to the latters' accounts.[432]

---

425. TA, iii, 359.
426. TA, iv, 325.
427. TA, 471, iii, 194, 198, 414, iv, 74, 80, 135.
428. TA, iv, 400.
429. See Appendix No.
430. TA, iv, 396-419.
431. For details see chapter on Comptroller's Accounts.
432. See Appendix No.

At the foot of the 'Bursa Regis' section of the discharge it was customary to record allowances paid to the treasurer and his assistants for the duration of the account. For instance, at the foot of the accounting ending 10 February 1504-5 an allowance of £333-6-8 was submitted to David Beaton, treasurer, 'for his grete laubouris, trawell, costis and expens, maid be him and his servituris the tyme of the Kingis mariage and at uther tymes within this compt, that is to say be the space of twa zeris and a half'. Other assistants received smaller payments; sir James Kincraigie was allowed £40 'for his grete laubouris', the clarks of penalties and of the chancery were in receipt of £26-13/- and Master John Murray and Henry Mair collected £10.[433]

The sums allowed to the treasurer in the 'Bursa Regis' section of his discharge varied enormously from one account to another. Nevertheless, these totals were frequently the largest of the account, for, between June 1488 and August 1492 £17,313 out of a total expenditure of £34,647 was included under that heading, although, with the increase of expenditure on the king's fleet, public works, artillery and various other items, the 'Bursa Regis' expense bill tended to have a less dramatic impact on the account total. For instance, in 1507-8 the amount of cash expended under the heading 'Bursa Regis' amounted to £5,016 out of a total discharge of £31,841 and in 1511-2 the proportion was £9,870 out of £38,771.[434]

Concerning the treasurer's discharge, the figures clearly reveal that the sums expended by that official were dependant on the sums collected. An extraordinarily large charge usually resulted in an equally extensive discharge. Two examples clearly demonstrated this assertion; firstly the unusually large expenditure of £30,000 between June 1488 and February 1491-2 was undoubtedly occasioned by the large receipt total of £31,800,

---

433. TA, ii, 479.
434. See Appendix No.

the result of the inclusion of James III's hoard, and secondly, between 1502 and 1506 a total of £95,500 was expended by the treasurer, possible only through the windfall of £25,000 resulting from the dowry of Margaret Tudor. Unlike the comptroller, whose expenditure was to a large extent fixed, it would appear that the treasurer tended to cut his coat according to the material available.[435] In contrast, the relatively small charge total for the account ending August 1513 of £10,275 produced an equally insignificant discharge of £12,241.[436] However, excluding these exceptional years, the general trend of the treasurer's expenditure was, like his income, upward. Between June 1494 and January 1496-7 the average annual expense total amounted to £5,000, whereas during the last four years of the reign of James IV for which treasurers' accounts have survived, the average annual total had risen to £29,631.[437] It is obvious from these figures that the treasurer, during the latter half of James IV's reign, not only dealt with an increasing number of items of expenditure, but also that the scale of the financial business involved in these accounts snowballed dramatically. In common with the comptroller, was frequently over expended. In 1474 John Laing, bishop of Glasgow recorded a deficit of £1,179 in the sole account for the reign of James III.[438] The accounts of lord St. John were cushioned to a large extent by the acquisition of James III's treasure which amounted to £24,517-10/- and assured the treasurer of a final surplus of £488.[439] Although, on 16 August 1495 Henry Arnot, abbot of Cambuskenneth, received a discharge under the

---

435. See Appendix No.

436. TA, iv, 366,447. The duration of the account was from October 1512 to August 1513 and a substantial portion of the charge total was derived from the ecclesiastical tax contribution.

437. Between June 1494 and January 1496-7 ($2\frac{1}{2}$ years) the total allowance amounted to £12,252 while the gross discharge for the years 1506-7, 1507-8, 1511-2, and 1512-3 totalled £118,523.

438. TA, i, 75.

439. TA, i, 205.

great seal of James IV for his accounts as treasurer, in April 1497, the king was forced to assign £137-14-8, the rests of the estreats of the justice ayres of Ayr to the abbot 'for the outred of our soverane Lordis dettis'.[440] In January 1496-7, George Shaw, abbot of Paisley, ended his accounts with a deficit of £3,200.[441] During the tenures of David Beaton of Creich and his successor, James Beaton, abbot of Dunfermline, there was a consecutive series of treasurers' accounts from February 1500-1 to August 1508. With the assistance of the queen's dowry, a surplus of £20,439 had been accumulated by August 1506, by the following year the profit had dwindled to £9,311 and finally in August 1058 a loss of £2,446 was recorded.[442] There can be little doubt that the financial position of these accounts would have been even worse without the windfall of the English dowry. Between August 1511 and the same month the following year, Andrew Stewart, bishop of Caithness, seems to have incurred heavy financial losses, partly on account of the cost of the preparations for Flodden, for in his office as treasurer he was over-expended to the tune of £7,432 and as receiver to the tune of £2,036.[443] By October 1512 the royal debt had been cleared, principally by charging himself with 500 marks 'given to the King by the accountant' and also theough the receipt of £5,389, part of the tax contribution granted by the clergy.[444] Finally, the account of Cuthbert Baillie which ended in August 1513 recorded a deficit of £1,965.[445]

However, in the earlier accounts of the reign of James IV, there would appear to have been a certain laxness or reluctance on the part of both the treasurer and crown debtors to honour their obligations. In 1492,

---

440. Fraser, Cartulary of Cambuskenneth, 31. ADC, ii, 71.
441. TA, i, 271.
442. TA, iii, 210, 417, iv, 141.
443. TA, iv, 381.
444. TA, iv, 360-6, 382.
445. TA, iv, 447.

the treasurer, lord St. John, was stated to be 'dettour to the king' for a series of entries of feudal casualties and sheriffs' receipts totalling £1,101 which had apparently been paid over to lord St.John but had remained 'unchargeit' in his rolls.[446] In 1496-7 a 'memorandum' complained that 'thir are the sowmes eftir folowing, that fell within the tyme of the Thesaurare, that he chargis him nocht with, suppose thai pertenit to his office' and the total value of the items amounted to over £7,444-13-4. Some of the entries were stated to have been charged to the present treasurer's successor, sir Robert Lundy of Balgony, some appear to have been remitted or assigned, the relief of the laird of Rattray was paid to the king in the form of two horses, many were merely classified as being owed to the king and concerning the composition for a remission granted to the Laird of Costorphin, it was remarked that there was no knowledge of who had received it.[447] On the other hand, in 1492 lord St. John alleged the existance of outstanding payments, amounting to £515 'of the quhilkis the comptare sais he has obligacionis and in his bukis'. And tharefore he and thai to be callit for the payment thareofe'.[448]

In common with the comptroller, the treasurer took allowance for payments which in fact he had not made. In order to ensure complete repayment of outstanding sums, a resort to judicial action was required. On 14 July 1498 Thomas Carkettle, executor to the lare Marjory Carkettle, his mother pursured an action against William lord St. John, 'sumtyme Thesaurare to our soverane Lord' for the withholding of £103-6-8 as the price of certain merchandise received from Marjory.[449]

---

446. TA, i, 207-8.
447. TA, i, 220-2
448. TA, i, 205-6.
449. ADC, ii, 271.

THE TREASURER'S ACCOUNTS : CHARGE SIDE

Like the comptroller, the office of treasurer sprang from the administrative reforms undertaken by James I on his return to Scotland in 1424. The revolution in the crown's fiscal arrangements witnessed the removal of the financial monopoly previously exercised by the chamberlain and responsibility for the king's revenues being split between the new offices of comptroller and treasurer.

The office of treasurer appears to have been largely an ecclesiastical monopoly, for, from the reign of James II to that of James IV, of the twenty one appointments, only four were laymen. Undoubtedly their clerical education and experience would have been extremely useful in such an undertaking, but in addition they had the necessary time to devote to the various tasks of treasurer. The comptroller seems to have been a more powerful and influencial figure, being heavily involved in the administration and disbursement of royal finances, and also possessing a large number of subordinates. However, the revenue collected by the treasurer was larger than that of the comptroller and also more directly under his personal control. Instead of merely collecting revenues from subordinate local officials, the treasurer was a permanent determining influence in settling the extent and terms of payments bound for his own coffers. A substantial proportion of the treasurer's receipts assumed the form of a composition which tended to be regulated and paid according to the dictates of the treasurer. Whereas, the comptroller's receipts were submitted through the vehicle of various local accountants, the Ballivi ad extra custumars and burgh baillies, and the speed and size of payment were naturally affected by the fact that two parties were involved, the original subscriber and the accountant, the treasurer's receipts originated directly from the subscriber. It also appears that the treasurer was involved in activities outside finance, he could be sent

on embassies, and frequently participated on the king's council.[1] Essentially, the office of treasurer does not seem to have attracted the same degree of unpopularity as that attached to the comptroller, for, compared with the forty five separate appointments to the latter office during the reigns of James II, III and IV, the treasurer recorded only twenty one.[2]

An assessment of the early development of the office of treasurer must inevitably be somewhat sketchy as no accounts have survived and a heavy reliance must be placed on isolated references from other fiscal sources. During the reign of James I and a large portion of that of James II, there seems to have existed considerable confusion as to the exact responsibilities of the two offices of comptroller and the treasurer. In the 1424-25 account of the custumars and burgh baillies, both the comptroller (£817) and the treasurer (£217), along with other 'receivers', received the net income of the crown, although the overall responsibility for the receipts appear to have rested with the chamberlain.[3] In the comptrollers' accounts of 1450 and 1452, the charge side of the accounts recorded receipts from compositions for feudal casualties, remissions and administrative fees, income which was later associated with the treasurer.[4] On the other hand, early references seem to indicate that the treasurer handled revenue which was later accounted for by the comptroller. From the 1426 accounts of the custumars and burgh baillies,

---

1. Appendix No. A/1(a) List of treasurers. ADC, iii, 22, 419. TA, vi, 239.

2. Details of appointments by each reign.

James II	Appointments to the treasurership, 6: to the comptrollership, 17.
James III	Appointments to the treasurership, 6: to the comptrollership, 16.
James IV	Appointments to the treasurership, 9: to the comptrollership, 12.

3. ER, iv, 379-99.

4. ER, v, 392-396, 604-6.

the treasurer, Walter Ogilvy, received a total of £733.[5] Between 1426 and 1431, the designation 'thesaurarius domus domini nostri regis' was given to the treasurer and it is conceivable that he shared, along with the comptroller, responsibility for the king's household, but in the following years, he is merely designed 'thesaurarius scotie'.[6] In 1434, Thomas Cranstone intromitted for the rents of crown property and lands held in royal ward as the king's receiver south of the Forth 'sub thesaurario scotie constitutus' but despite that designation, it was the comptroller not the treasurer who received the net income from Cranstone.[7] In an early, and very fragmented account of the treasurer, Walter Haliburton of Dirleton, a total receipt of £96-9s was drawn from certain burgh baillies, custumars and also the sheriff of Edinburgh for the period 25 June to 21 July 1438. The reason for this intrusion into the comptroller's sphere is unknown and there is no record of the manner in which the money was expended.[8] However, for the remainder of the reign of James II, the treasurer made periodic receipts from the Ballivi ad Extra, custumars and burgh baillies, especially in 1453-4, when a total of £265 was paid from these sources to the treasurer.[9] Also the treasurer appears to have been a fairly active official; he was present at the 1438 trial of the Pix,[10] a frequent auditor of the Exchequer,[11] present at the justice ayre of Lochmaben in 1454[12] and, in co-operation with the comptroller, engaged

---

5. ER, iv, 400-427.

6. ER, iv, 408, 410, 412, 414, 542, 552.

7. ER, iv, 597-603.

8. ER, v, 39. These payments to the treasurer were not the result of a vacancy in the office of comptroller since Alexander Nairn was still comptroller on 18 July 1438. ER, iv, 64. This account contained no discharge.

9. ER, v, 609-692, vi, 124, 202, 233.

10. ER, v, 67.

11. ER, v, 369, 391, 420, vi, 113, 382, 498.

12. ER, v, 670.

in leasing crown lands in Ettrick Forest, Methven, Fife and March,[13] In addition, even at this early date, the treasurer was giving the comptroller considerable financial assistance; in 1450, £221-3-4 was received into the account of Alexander Napier, and, in 1456 a further £449-7s was accepted by Ninian Spot.[14] However, during the reigns of James I and II, the office of treasurer had not yet attained its early sixteenth century model, its responsibilities were far from settled and frequently in confusion with those of the comptroller, and many items of expenditure, later associated with the treasurer, were financed from other sources. Concerning the latter point, frequent submissions of revenue to other royal 'receivers' and also to merchants and other royal suppliers directly from the local customs' accounts suggested that the office of treasurer was still in an embryonic stage. The cost of supplies of cloth, linen, silk, fur and other merchandice for the use of the royal family and its servants, later the responsibility of the treasurer, was offset by custumars from their gross income, as in 1448, when £676 was allowed in the custumars' account of Edinburgh for the purchase of various cloths, furs, spices, gold, silver,armour and other items.[15]

During the period of the vacancy in the office of comptroller, between 1461-4, many of the latter's functions were performed by the treasurer, David Guthrie. During this three year interlude, Guthrie received revenue from royal property, customs and burgh farms and was also engaged in leasing certain crown estates.[16] In addition to the treasurer, the king's stewart also received payments directly from local sources for the expenses of the king's household.[17] With the reappoint-

---

13. ER, vi, 227, 243, 253, 258.

14. ER, v, 394, vi, 289.

15. ER, v, 312.

16. ER, vii, 77-611, 245, 345, 607.

17. ER, vii, 108, 117, 121, 130, 136, 147, 213.

ment of a comptroller in 1464, it is likely that a firm demarcation between the duties of the two offices was settled, for when David Guthrie combined the offices of comptroller and treasurer between 1466 and 1468, their respective incomes were kept quite distinct.[18]

In common with the comptroller, any attempt at a detailed analysis of the responsibilities and duties of the treasurer during the reign of James III is undermined immediately by the lack of surviving information. However, one account of the Lord High Treasurer, covering the period from 4 August 1473 to 1 December 1474, has fortunately survived. For the sixteen months of the account, the treasurer, John, bishop of Glasgow, entered a charge totalling £3,240-19-9.[19] Compared with the treasurers' accounts for the reign of James IV, the gross income of this account was on a very small scale. A large proportion of the charge was composed of compositions for feudal casualties (£355), royal charters (£1,068), remissions (£768), and the issues of various justice ayres (£379). In addition, 'the chargis of the last jakkers', amounting to £613, comprised of receipts solely from the sheriffs' accounts, with no reference to any income from other local accountants.[20] Most of the entries in this account were of no great significance and fell into categories which will be fully explained later in connection with the accounts relating to the reign of James IV, but there were a few of interest. Thomas Black, Englishman, paid a composition of £10 to the treasurer for his safe-conduct, the burgh of Peebles submitted a composition of £50 'for a lettre grantit to thame vnder the priue sele anent certane priueleges' while Arthur Forbes paid £10 as a part payment of a composition for a grassum.[21] Reference

---

18. ER, vii, 418, 442-588.

19. TA, i, 12.

20. TA, i, 2-12

21. TA, i, 3, 4.

is made of the king's coffers in this account, for the treasurer was charged with a sum of £104, part payment of a larger total of £500, of which £100 had been submitted in the last account of the treasurer, and the remainder, £296, 'is pait to the Kingis coffris, as the Archdene of Sanctandros beris witnes'.[22] Most of the individual payments which formed this charge were small in amount and the only entry of any size was a composition for £500 submitted by James Shaw and Michael Balfour for a remission for those present at the slaughter of Thomas Preston.[23]

After the battle of Sauchieburn in 1488, there was a dramatic increase in material relating to the treasurers' accounts and consequently an analysis of the scope and powers of the office must be confined to the reign of James IV. During this reign there was an almost continuous series of accounts, the only real gap occurring between August 1508 and the same month in 1511. Although it was desirable that the accounts of the comptroller and treasurer should be audited as soon after the main Exchequer as possible, this does not appear to have been strictly adhered to. The first account of sir William Knollis, lord St. John, was audited in Edinburgh on 24 February 1491-2 'before thir Auditouris underwrittin, be vertu and strenth of our Souuerain Lordis commissioun'.[24] It was not uncommon for the audit to take place a considerable time after the account had ceased, for the account of David Beaton of Creich, from 16 September 1502 to 10 February 1504-5, was not audited until the 25 August 1505.[25] During the early part of the reign, many of the accounts were of irregular duration; the first account of David Beaton lasted from February 1501-2 until September 1502, while his second account, as mentioned above, encompassed

---

22. TA, i, 12.

23. TA, i, 11.

24. TA, i, 166. The audit of the treasurer occurred between the Exchequer audits of 1491 and 1492. ER, x, 247, 295, 311, 352. The Exchequer audits occurred between 18 June to 30 July 1491 and 3 June 1492 to 26 January 1492-3.

25. TA, ii, 163.

a total of twenty nine months.[26] Despite the fact that the account of the abbot of Paisley was not closed until January 1496-7, in November 1495 there appears an interim examination of the account since there was an entry in the charge of compositions made 'sen examinacioune of this charge abone writin, quhilk was in Striueling, the xviii day of Nouember, in the zere of God, etc., lxxxxv zeris'.[27] However, from 1507, annual accounts were more generally employed.[28]

The importance of the treasurers' accounts to the crown can be assessed by the prominance of the auditors commissioned to supervise them. In 1492 the tenor of the commission directed to the chancellor, stated that 'we charge zow that ze tak the Lordis of oure Counsale, and that ze here the Tresauraris compt and defeis, and allow as ze think accordis to resone. And this ze do alssone as ze may haue lasere for our grete materis of Parliament'.[29] The auditors of the Exchequer were appointed annually from the Lords of the King's Council, but because the treasurer and the comptroller were always among the auditors and because their accounts were often submitted for audit outside the brief period of the Exchequer's sitting, their accounts were audited by special commission under the great seal.[30] Although the quorum varied in number, there seems to have been a pool of persons considered for this task. Apart from the earls of Argyll and Lennox, the majority of regular auditors of the treasurers' accounts were either churchmen, like William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, Andrew Forman, bishop of Moray, Henry Alan, abbot of Jedburgh, John, prior of St. Andrews and Master Gavin Dunbar, archdeacon

---

26. TA, ii, 1, 163.

27. TA, i, 209, 218.

28. TA, iii, 211, iv, I, 143.

29. TA, i, 166.

30. TA, iv, 383-4.

of St. Andrews, or professional men, like Patrick Paniter, the king's secretary, Robert Colville of Hilton, director of the chancery and Richard Roberts. The comptroller was also a frequent attender at the treasurers' audit. Not only were many of these persons of considerable fiscal and administrative experience, but several were also personally associated with some of the entries within the accounts in question. Knowledge of the actual working of the audit is limited by the formal nature of the accounts, but it would seem that the auditors were required to examine vouchers shown on the account, scrutinized precepts, gifts of offices and pensions, investigate minor accounts included in the treasurer's discharge and authorize payments 'by their consideration' when they were merited.[31]

Before 1501, the treasurers' charge was not set out in any established form; in 1497 some attempt was made at dividing the various entries into groups, while in 1498, the charge was arranged in chronological order.[32] However, after 1501 the various entries tended to be presented under separate headings. The arrangement of the treasurers' charge was as follows; receipts from the sheriffs, compositions derived from the issues of the justice and chamberlain ayres, from feudal casualties, remissions outside the ayres, escheated goods, charters, annual receipts from lands temporarily under the treasurer's control, and other minor items of revenue.

Firstly, the treasurer was charged with receipts from the sheriffs according to the 'responsiones' entered in the sheriffs' rolls. They were limited according to the accounts which fell within the duration of a particular treasurer's statement. The income from this source varied considerably, in 1504 and 1506 the total receipts amounted to £3,120 and

---

31. TA, xii, XLIV-XLV.

32. TA, i, 209-222, 312-318.

£4,106 respectively, while in 1512 and 1513 the sheriffs provided only £566 and £256.[33] Even between these extreme poles there was considerable variation in receipts from this source, the result not only of the accidental and inconsistent nature of the sheriffs' own receipts but also from the fact that the majority of sheriffs accounted only at irregular intervals. On the surface, a paradoxical situation was seen to exist, namely that despite the increase in the business transacted in the accounts of the sheriff during the reign of James IV, a similar trend was not reflected in the treasurers' receipts from that source. However, the increasing exploitation of feudal casualties and justice receipts on the part of the crown coincided with an alteration in accounting practice, involving a shift of emphasis from the localised sheriff to the treasurer. Although in evidence at the outset of the reign of James IV, it gained in momentum as the reign progressed. Previously, the 'responsiones' had included the payment of certain compositions due for fines and feudal casualties[34] and if these were subsequently included in the list of compositions recorded in the treasurer's charge, the entry was deleted. In the 1496 account of the abbot of Paisley, a composition of 200 marks made with sir William Cockburn of Scraling for a remission was deleted from the treasurer's charge, since it had already been included in the credit side of the account of the sheriff of Peebles,[35] while, in the 1504 account of David Beaton, a composition of £500 for the relief, non-entry and marriage of the heir of the late William Mure of Polkelly was 'not charged' to the treasurer at this point as he had already been charged with the sum in his receipt

---

33. TA, ii, 165, iii, 2-3, iv, 144, 384.

34. ER, xi, 356, 369, 384. The sheriff was allowed the full value of the casualty or judicial fine in his account and the composition was entered as being paid to the treasurer, who was then bound to answer for the payment.

35. TA, i, 211.

from the baillie of Cunningham.[36] Such arrangements invited confusion and duplication and the trend was to transfer complete responsibility for these compositions from the sheriff to the treasurer, with the former's interest being confined merely to paper work. Although the sheriff was still charged with the total value of the casualty or fine, the entry was automatically discharged from his account as being the direct responsibility of the treasurer. The actual payment of the composition did not involve the sheriff in any way as the cash was submitted directly to the treasurer who was solely responsible for fiscal aspect of the transaction. In 1506, the treasurer was charged with a total of £160 from four sheriffs 'extra rotulos', these were entries for which allowance had not as yet been given to the sheriff.[37] This alteration in the administration of part of the crown's income was one of the principal features in the decline of the fiscal responsibility of the sheriff, affecting not so much the formation of his accounts but more the actual amount of money handled by that official. Conversely, this financial reform greatly enhanced the fiscal responsibility of the treasurer.

This change in the fiscal machinery at the previous Exchequer affected two of the sheriff's principal sources of revenue, the issues of the justice ayres and those feudal casualties payable by crown vassals.

During the circuit of the justice ayre, the justiciar was always accompanied by the treasurer and two Lords Compositors, whose task was to settle the terms of the compositions, whereby those convicted were able to purchase a remission of their fines and unlaws. At the opening of the justice ayre, a proclamation was issued to the effect that all those seeking the royal pardon should submit 'thair desyris for their componitouris' at

---

36. TA, ii, 189.

37. TA, ii, 31-2.

the treasurer's lodgings.[38] The 'componitours' issued by the clerks contained the names of the offenders, their crime and the amount of cash payable by each and they were signed by the treasurer and the two compositors.[39] The compositions were settled by the treasurer and the compositors and on payment of the composition the person received his letters of remission. On the 12 November 1495, Alexander Stratton of the Knox, in the presence of the lords of the Council, delivered a composition to the treasurer after which it was stated that 'it is componit be oure soverane lordis tresaurare and the compositouris for ane remissioune to be maid in dew forme under oure soverane lordis gret sele to Alexander Stratoun of the knox for art and parte of the reff of ane horse... subscriuit be the said thesaurare and compositouris at bervy the vii day of august, the zere of god (1490).[40] If security could be found 'the compositour', in common with remissions issued under the great and privy seals, halted all further criminal proceedings.[41] Howĕver, in 1510 John Dalgleish produced a signature of remission for the burning of Branxholm and Ancrum and various other crimes but as he could not find security he was to be warded for forty days by the sheriff and if he still could not find security he was to be hanged.[42] On the conclusion of a composition with the treasurer, responsibility for the cash involved was automatically transferred from the sheriff to the treasurer. The sheriff was no longer responsible for the collection of unlaws from those who had either compounded for a remission

---

38. TA, xii, xxvi. 'Desire' was probably a statement of offences for which pardons were sought and from which the clerks drew up the compositours.

39. Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, iii, 56-8. See Appendix No.A/3(c)

40. ADC, i, 426. For examples (in latin), see Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, iii, 56-8, 77.

41. Pitcairn, 30, 32, 33, 34.

42. Pitcairn, 69.

or were able to show a remission which had previously been granted to them. An extract of the remaining unlaws at the terminations of the ayre were transmitted by the Justice Clerk to the sheriff, whose task it was to ensure their collection.[43] The composition presented a far more efficient method of collecting cash receipts for the purchase of remissions and although this system was extensively employed by James IV, his predecessor was by no means oblivious to its potential. On 4 November 1472, for instance, sir John Lain, treasurer to the king, issued a discharge to John, lord Darnley for the payment of 113¼ marks, in part payment of the sum of £100 due to the crown for the compositions derived from four justice ayres held on the island of Bute.[44] The payment of a composition to the treasurer might be submitted partly in ready cash, but the shortage of available cash frequently forced the subscriber to either grant a bond or find surety for the amount due. In 1495, Hugh Rose of Kilravock received a letter of quittance from the treasurer for the sum of £42, owed to the king by the terms of his obligation for the remission of a certain penalty incurred at the justice ayre of Inverness.[45] On 6 July 1510, the earl of Caithness became surety to the king for remissions granted to his tenants and servants in Caithness.[46] Compositions were frequently paid in instalments. In 1501, David Beaton, treasurer, granted a letter of discharge to lord Montgomery for 100 marks out of a total composition of 500 marks, levied on those persons convicted at the justice ayre of Ayr of the theft of a collar and a sword[47]. In the majority of accounts, the treasurer was charged only with the total return of compositions collected from each individual ayre.

---

43. Pitcairn, 19, 24, 26, 37, 38, 41, 56, 59, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 96.

44. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 85.

45. Innes, Rose of Kilravock, 163-4.

46. S.R.O., Mey charters, G.D. 96/13.

47. Fraser, Memorials of the Montgomeries Earls of Eglington, ii, 72.

In the 1473-4 account, a list of the individual compositions was given at length, revealing both the persons involved and the crimes for which they were convicted.[48] The sums for which the criminal compounded obviously depended on the number of persons involved, the nature of the crime and the settlement made between the criminal and the treasurer. In addition to the combined total of several compositions from a particular justice ayre, in 1501 the treasurer was also charged separately with £333-6-8, a composition made with Archibald, earl of Argyll for a general remission to the inhabitants of Argyll and Lorne and £82 in 1511 for the composition of eighty two persons living in Kylesmure convicted at the justice ayre of Ayr.[49] In his account, the treasurer was only charged with the sums actually recovered. For instance, from the justice ayre held at Selkirk in November 1502; compositions for remission totalled £172-13-4, of which the treasurer, David Beaton of Creich, was charged with £149-13-4 in his 1505 account, the remaining £23, the obligations of various persons, were to be charged to the treasurer in a future account when the cash was actually recovered.[50] Thus, the treasurer's ability to achieve full payment of the justice ayre compositions in the appropriate account was not always possible. However the situation varied greatly, for in the 1505 account 67% of the total composition had been collected during the period of the account, the 1506 account could only boast of a 38% collection, while between 1511 and 1512 a total of 80% was accumulated.[51] If the justice ayre occurred towards the termination of a particular account, it was obviously difficult for the treasurer to avoid the accumulation of a

---

48. TA, i, 6-10.

49. TA, ii, 5, iv, 159.

50. TA, ii, 166.

51. Details of the figures:

	Accounts 1504-5	1506	1512
Amount charged	£2,629-14s	£1,855-10-6	£7,102-16-8
Total composition	£3,785-13-4	£4,489-16-8	£8,891-2s.
Percentage collected	67%	38%	80%

large rest. As the justice ayre of Lauder was held in 1506, close to the time of the audit of the account of James Beaton, abbot of Dunfermline, only £26-13-4 out of a composition total of £1,012-6-8 had been paid to the treasurer by the opening of the audit.[52] The sums which remained uncollected during the period of the original account were frequently repaid in instalments in future treasurers' accounts.[53] Full payment of compositions to the treasurer for remissions were often considerably delayed. In December 1504, the justice ayre of Jedburgh recorded compositions to the value of £188-6-8, of which £81 had been settled in the account of David Beaton in February 1504-5, leaving a rest of £97-6-8. In the 1507 account of James Beaton a further £20 was repaid and by 1512 further payments and remissions had reduced the rest to 20 marks.[54] Thus, over a period of at least eight years successive treasurers were collecting, by a series of irregular instalments, the rest of a composition. Such an occurrence was by no means unusual and explains the existance of large rests attached to several treasurers' accounts. In common with other royal financial officials, the treasurer was often compelled, when confronted with reluctance to pay the full composition, to pursue his case in the courts. On 12 November 1501, David Beaton opened judicial proceedings against Thomas, lord Fraser of Lovat and Alexander Gordon of Midmar for the withholding of £34 and £11 respectively for compositions for the remission of certain persons convicted at the last justice ayre of Aberdeen. Having alleged that they had made full payment and were willing to produce their quittances, they were ordered either to show their proof on a specific date or enter themselves in ward in Blackness Castle and remain there at

---

52. TA, iii, 11.

53. TA, iii, 3-4, 213-221, iv, 144-5.

54. TA, ii, 168-9, iii, 214, iv, 144-5. The last rest of 20 marks never reappears in subsequent treasurers' accounts and there is no knowledge if it was ever paid.

their own expense until the sums were paid.[55] It is seen that defaulters were pursued with considerable vigour and continual failure to make proper payment was often met with severe punishment. On the 27 March 1503, Robert, lord Chichton of Sanquhar, William, lord Carlyle and Andrew, lord Herries were summoned by David Beaton to answer for their failure to pay certain compositions settled at the last justice ayre of Dumfries under the threat of doubling the original amount.[56] If the person indicted was unwilling or unable to pay the fine imposed at a justice ayre, the sheriff was then ordered to apprize a prescribed portion of the defaulter's property for the debt and his lands were often assigned by the king to whoever was willing to pay the equivalent of the composition to the treasurer.[57] This transaction was an investment, since, in return for the initial outlay to the treasurer, he was granted temporary occupation of the portion of land until the debt was fully repaid. On 23 April 1498, George, earl of Rothes was summoned before the justiciar to answer for the murder of George Leslie and on his failure to appear at the appointed time, he was fined £100, but with subsequent failures to answer summonses in February 1501 and October 1503, his fine was augmented to £1,000.[58] Failure or inability to pay judicial debts frequently resulted in part of the debtor's property being apprized to the king who subsequently sold the land to a third party willing to compound with the treasurer for the concession. On 12 June 1506 the lands of Glenduky in the barony of Ballinbreich were apprized for a debt of 800 marks owed to the crown by George, earl of Rothes for fines incurred at the justice ayre of Cupar in 1503. The lands in question were then sold to Andrew Ayton, captain of Stirling Castle on his submission of a composition of £373-13-4 to the treasurer for the infeftment.[59] By 1506, the £1,000 was not forthcoming,

---

55. ADC, (Stair Society), 100.

56. ADC, xiv, f 82.

57. RMS, ii, 3522.

58. Hist. MSS, Comm., Appendix to 4th Report, 508.

59. TA, iii, 21. RMS, ii, 2970. The eighth penny to the abbot of Dunfermline was deducted from the total before it reached the treasurer's charge.

with the result portions of his property in the barony of Ballinbreich were apprized and temporarily granted to sir Alexander Boswell of Glassmount and Andrew Ayton, who, in return for the concession, compounded with the treasurer.[60] In addition, in 1501, the lands of Kirkpatrick-Irongray, the property of George Herries of Terrauchty, were apprized to the crown for fines totalling 600 marks and were regranted to sir James Crichton of Frendraueh on payment of a composition to the king.[61] Although the treasurer had failed to extract payment from the original offender, by involving a third party, the crown was not left out of pocket. Although a composition involved the payment of a sum smaller than the original fine this expedient was encouraged by the crown as it afforded a greater possibility of payment. That it was a popular arrangement was evident from the number of persons willing to participate in the scheme. Also the collection of individual unlaws by the sheriff according to the extract provided by the justice clerk was a rather laborious process while the use of compositions tended to reduce sheriff's responsibility for payment and thereby lessening the possibility of delay and evasion. This system benefitted both participants, the crown greatly increased its financial revenue from royal justice while those fortunate enough to possess sufficient wealth or able to obtain suitable security avoided the full processes of the law. The only sufferer was the legal system itself which was diluted in effect to suit fiscal demands. It was a private contract between the criminal and the king's treasurer and Lord Compositors and payment was submitted directly to the treasurer. Also, it was not uncommon for one who had compounded with the treasurer to receive a remission of part of the actual composition. In 1505 £400 of the compositions levied at the justice ayre of Dumfries was remitted to Lord Carlyle.[62] In the 1512 account, the total composition levy amounted to £8,891-2s, of

---

60. RMS, ii, 2942, 2970.

61. RMS, ii, 2612.

62. TA, ii, 166.

which £7,102-16-8 was charged to the treasurer and a further £663-6-4 was freely remitted to various persons.[63] Cuthbert, earl of Glencairn was remitted the sum of 200 marks by the king, his son was remitted 100 marks of his composition by the Lord Compositors, while both the Compositors and the treasurer allowed Nicholas Smerles 20 marks of his composition on account of his poverty.[64] On 8 February 1494-5 the abbot of Cambuskenneth as treasurer issued a quittance to Hugh Rose of Kilravock for £42 owed to the crown according to the tenor of his obligation for a composition settled at the justice ayre of Inverness but the king remitted the sum to Hugh 'as the saide letteris beris, quhilkis we have ressavit to show upon compt for our warrant'.[65]

Concerning compositions sir David Lindsay stated:-

> Sic pykand peggrall theifis ar hangit,
> Bot he that all the warld hes wrangit,
> Ane cruell tyrane ane strang transgressour,
> Ane common publick plaine oppressour
> By buds may he obteine favours
> Of tresurers and compositours.
> Thocht he serve greit punitioun
> Gets easie compositioun.[66]

Whatever the moral drawbacks of the system of commuting criminal punishment to cash levies as expounded by Lindsay, it was both convenient and profitable to the crown. As well as private complaints against the prolific selling of remissions for cash compositions and the injurious effect on the efficient administration of royal justice, official statutes in the reigns of James II and James III legislated against the excessive granting of

---

63. The remainder formed the rest carried into the next account.

64. TA, iv, 159-60.

65. Innes, Rose of Kilravock, 163.

66. Lindsay, Satyre of the Thrie Estaits, ed., Kinsley, 133.

remissions.[67] In 1487 a Parliamentary statute called for a seven year halt in the granting of remissions by the crown, stating that 'his Realme is greitlie brokin in the self his liegis troublit and heryit throw tresoun, slauchter, reif, birning, thift and oppin heirschip throw default of scharp executioun of justice and ouer commoun granting of grace and remissiounis to tres-passouris'.[68] From the scant evidence available, it would appear that James III lacked interest in the administration of justice - he was notorious for his continual absence from justice ayres - and that his sole concern centred around the revenue that could be gleaned from remissions. The profits of justice formed a considerable part of royal revenues and James IV's personal attendance at several justice ayres during his reign, demonstrated his interest in maintaining its efficient operation. It is significant that no Parliamentary complaints against the persisant granting of remissions occurred during this reign. Although James IV made extensive use of the composition as a means of levying punishment for criminal actions brought to justice at the ayre, the issues from the 'extract' of unlaws submitted by the sheriff and certain compositions contracted within the sheriffs' rolls still remained considerable. In fact, until at least 1508, the receipts accepted by the treasurer from the sheriffs' accounts were swollen by unlaws levied at the various justice ayres. Between September 1502 and August 1508, receipts from the sheriffs amounted to £18,052 for the six years, while the issues from compositions for remission amounted to only £8,145. However between 1511 and 1512, the former only totalled £66, whereas £8,047-3-10 was derived from justice ayre compositions.[69]

The attempts by James IV to introduce royal justice into the Highland

---

67. APS, ii, 33, 50, 118, 165.

68. APS, ii, 176.

69. See Appendix No. B/9(a) Annual totals from the Treasurers' accounts are extremely difficult to assess as the accounts were of varying duration.

and Border regions were reflected in the composition receipts from these areas.[70] In 1498 a memorandum stated that George Shaw, abbot of Paisley was not responsible in the present account for the issues of the justice ayre of Inverness held in January 1497-8, the profits from which amounted to £1,254-3-4.[71] In 1512, the treasurer, Andrew, bishop of Caithness, was charged with £2,213 for compositions from the justice ayre of Ayr, £2,065 from that of Wigtown, £1,588 from that of Kirkcudbright and £1,222 from the ayre of Aberdeen.[72] Fiscal exploitation of royal justice in the remoter regions of Scotland helped to swell the receipts for the justice ayres.

Secondly, the profits of royal justice extended to include compositions levied on remissions from outside the justice ayre, respites and escheated goods. These remissions were granted outside the ayre, 'extra itinera', and the composition were not due until the letters of remission had been raised. In 1505, the treasurer was not charged with 100 marks as a composition of remission to John Cheyne and James Black since they had not yet received their letters of remission.[73] Remissions were granted for a variety of reasons, sir Robert Lauder of Bass compounded with the treasurer in 1506 for 1,000 marks for a royal licence to embark on a pilgrimage abroad.[74] In 1512 the heirs of John Simonston and William Inglis paid £1,000 as part of a £2,000 composition for a royal licence to alienate their goods, lands and possessions despite the fact that they were under accusation for minting false coinage.[75] The majority of remissions were granted for participation

---

70. APS, ii, 241, 249. Lesley, History of Scotland, ed., Thomas Thompson, 81-2.

71. TA, i, 318.

72. TA, iv, 159-161.

73. TA, ii, 168. However, the treasurer was charged with only £38 in the 1506 account as a part payment of the composition.

74. TA, iii, 12.

75. TA, iv, 162.

in slaughter or murder, where the extent of the composition seems to have depended on the status of the person murdered. In 1502 sir David Hume of Wedderburn and his accomplices submitted a composition of 1,000 marks for a remission for their part in the killing of John Loudoun while George Summer and two others paid £50 for absolution for the murder of Thomas Culles.[76] Although most of the compositions for remissions during the reign of James IV were unknown causes, in the following reign such concessions were granted for leaving the country and residing in England without licence, deforcing messengers and bringing in false coins.[77] In addition, the king frequently granted a criminal a respite, a prorogation of judgement on a particular case. Such concessions were granted for both short and long periods and it was not unusual for these postponements to endure for nineteen years.[78] However, in 1504, John Carmichael, captain of Crawford, made part payment of a composition of 200 marks for a respite of five days.[79] Not unnaturally, the treasurers' income from remissions and respites tended to fluctuate considerably, between September 1507 and August 1508 the total receipt reached only £110, whereas from February 1500-1 to September 1502 and again from August 1511 to the same month in 1512, the total revenue amounted to £1,663 and £3,690 respectively.[80]

During the reign of James IV, compositions for escheats formed a separate entry in the treasurers' accounts.[81] At the first instance, the sheriff was responsible for the collection of escheats, but by the Act of

---

76. TA, ii, 6.

77. TA, v, 142, 143, 250, vi, 244.

78. TA, vi, 10, RSS, i, 66, 1877.

79. TA, ii, 169.

80. See Appendix No. B/9(a)

81. Up to 1518 there was a separate section in the treasurers' charge for escheat compositions, but after that date, the compositions from escheats and remissions were combined under a single heading.

1487, complaining of a loss of revenue to the crown from escheats through fraud and abuse on the part of the coroner, the sheriff was required to bring the issues of the escheat to the king and the treasurer.[82] In late Medieval Scotland, escheats were due from persons who had been put to the horn, executed criminals, suicides, bastards, and those dying without lawful heirs.[83] Although the sheriff still accounted for certain goods and produce from escheats,[84] much of the business in escheats was transacted outwith his accounts. In the reign of James IV, there was a large market for the sale of escheated goods, for which the recipient paid a composition to the treasurer. The extent of such transactions was reflected not only within the accounts of the treasurer but also in the Register of the Privy Seal where these gifts were recorded. The gift of an escheat assumed a variety of forms, for instance in March 1507-8, John Cranstone of Harlaw was required to pay a composition of £26-13-4 to the treasurer for the gift of 'x oxin, xxx bollis of akin corn sawin on the ground, iii kye, xl sheip and a chalder of atis and bere in stak', forfeited by Andrew Gilry, John and James Michaelson for the slaughter of James Congilton.[85] Other gifts might involve both the moveable and immoveable goods of the escheated person,[86] coined and uncoined money, and might even include his debts.[87] Gifts of escheated lands were frequently conceded by the king. In 1508, Patrick Sinclair of Spot was gifted 'al and hale of the malis, proffitis and dewiteis' of 6 marks of Redcastle and a markland called Merkfas in the barony of Ur escheated by Andrew Herries of Terregles 'being zere and day

---

82. APS, ii, 177.

83. TA, xii, xxii, RSS, i, 94, 101, 211, 234, 508, 2376.

84. ER, xi, 363, 375, 382.

85. RSS, i, 1636. TA, ii, 9, 147. The gift was dated 12 March 1507-8, but by 1512, it would seem that John Cranstone had not yet paid the composition to the treasurer as the entry in the account of the treasurer was declared 'not charged'.

86. RSS, i, 1582.

87. RSS, i, 1391.

our soverane lordis rebell and at his horne unrelaxit thairfra'.[88] The king was also entitled to present a new tenant to an escheated lease, for, in 1507 John Haldane of Gleneagles received the gift of the lease of 4 marks of Frandy in the barony of Gleneagles which had previously been held by Robert Stewart, now at the king's horn for murder.[89] Occasionally gifts of escheats passed beyond the bounds of individual property. In 1499, sir Robert Lundy of Balgony, the treasurer, was in receipt of the gift of all the lands, rents, tenements and annuals within the bounds of the burghs of Edinburgh, Perth, Haddington, Peebles and Cupar which fell into the hands of the crown through bastardy or through the failure of a legal heir, from the 1 May to the 2 September 1499.[90] The cost of such gifts was obviously dependant on the value of the lands and goods escheated. A composition of £600 was charged to the treasurer in 1502 for the escheated lands, tenements and annual rents of Robert Lauder, who died a bastard.[91] Large compositions were generally charged for the sale of goods and possessions of lairds, £300 for the goods of George Gordon of Trochan, £233-6-8 for those of Robert Gordon of Glen, £163-10-8 for those of Andrew Heriot of Trabroun, wealthy merchants, £133-6-8 for the goods of William Mowbray of Edinburgh and £100 for those of Robert Dickson of Peebles.[92] However, the sale of the goods of smaller men naturally involved more modest compositions.

Investment in crown escheats appears to have involved all ranks of society, namely magnates like the earls of Bothwell and Huntly and lord

---

88. RSS, i, 1721.

89. RSS, i, 1496.

90. RSS, i, 414. Perhaps one of the methods used to repay the treasurer for his overexpenditure.

91. TA, ii, 8.

92. TA, ii, 170-1, 187.

Gray,[93] lairds like Walter Heriot of Bernturk, James Stewart of Traquair and Thomas Kennedy of Bargany,[94] crown servants like Thomas Shaw, the master cook, and John Goldsmith of the royal chapel,[95] and merchants like William Carmichael and Robert Glen of Edinburgh.[96] It was not uncommon for the relative of the escheated person to purchase the goods concerned. In 1506 Joan Hepburn, widow of the late John Montgomery of Thornton, paid a composition of £100 for the escheated goods of her husband,[97] while in February 1500-01 the possessions of Marjory Sinclair, a bastard, were sold to her sister Margaret.[98] Frequently, persons whose goods had been declared escheat to the crown were subsequently in a position to buy them back again. In 1498, the earl of Rothes submitted a composition of £50 to the treasurer for 'his eschet gere, and the relesching of him fra the horne to a certaine day'.[99] The retrieving of ones goods and possessions from the king might be an expensive business, for John Carmichael, previously put to the horn, paid a composition of £266-13-4 for the return of his goods.[100] It would seem that the king's policy of selling royal escheats was open to abuse and fraud. On 20 July 1498 two persons, Alexander Gordon, deputy steward of Kirkcudbright and William McLellan, heir to the laird of Bomby, laid claim to the escheated goods of the late Donald McGill, Alexander through having compounded with George, abbot of Paisley, the king's treasurer, for the goods at £2, and William through the production of a letter of gift under the king's signet. The lords of the Exchequer declared neither claim justified,

---

93. RSS, i, 141, 546, 1283.

94. RSS, i, 1385, 2129, 2211.

95. RSS, i, 411, 570.

96. RSS, i, 971, 1919.

97. TA, iii, 13.

98. RSS, i, 654.

99. TA, i, 317.

100. TA, ii, 169.

the former as the £2 composition was too low, the goods being valued at £28, and the latter since only a letter under the privy seal was of any worth.[101] The following day, the escheated goods in question were regranted to William McLellan in a letter under the privy seal.[102] This example demonstrated not only that there was considerable competition for such gifts, but also that the king was eager to extract a maximum return from his patronage. In addition, it was vital that the king ensured that the recipient of a royal gift of escheated goods did not overstep the terms of his letter of gift, as in the case of sir Walter Forrester, who deforced the deputy baillie of Stirlingshire in order to seize goods in excess of his allotted forty 'nolts'.[103] By the act of 1430 wrecked vessels were liable to be escheated to the crown only if they belonged to countries 'quhilkis oysis and kepis the samyn law of brokin schippis in thare awin landis',[104] In 1511 Thomas Corry of Kelwood paid a composition of 20 marks for the bark called the 'Pikard' along with its cargo, which had been shipwrecked.[105]

In common with other judicial returns, the yield from composition for escheats fluctuated considerably, but in general the income from this source to the treasurer was never very large. From 1502 to 1508 the total revenue from escheat compositions amounted to £2,884 of which £2,083 were derived from the period September 1502 to February 1504-5.[106]

In the account of 1512, the treasurer, Andrew, bishop of Caithness, was charged with compositions from the chamberlain ayres, held within his account, amounting to a total of £1,536-12-9. The procedure for the

---

101. ADC, ii, 284.

102. RSS, i, 234. No indication of the extent of the composition.

103. ADC, ii, 320. A 'nolt' refers to cattle.

104. APS, ii, 19.

105. TA, iv, 163.

106. See Appendix No.B/9(a)

assessment and collection of compositions seem to have been similar to that adopted at the justice ayres.[107] The sums involved were extensive, 1,000 marks for a composition extracted from the inhabitants of Dundee, 500 marks from the inhabitants and those enjoying the privileges of the burgh of Perth, 1,000 marks in compositions from the chamberlain ayre held outside the burgh of Perth but inside the sheriffdom, and finally £100 from the chamberlain ayre of Cupar.[108]

In the accounts of January 1496-7 and September 1502, compositions were exacted separately from those 'convict of error'.[109] The issues from such convictions amounted to £760 in the former account and £103 in the latter.[110]

In conclusion, there can be little doubt that, under James IV, royal justice was not only pursued with great vigour, as displayed by the king's frequent personal attendance at justice ayres, but also the inherent profits obtainable from the execution of justice were exhibited to a much higher degree. It is possible to detect a consistent rise in the profits from the various courts, recorded in the treasurers' charge. Between June 1494 and July 1498, the average annual yield from justicial compositions amounted to £1,339, between September 1502 and August 1508, the annual profit had risen to £2,275 and finally, for the last two years of the reign of James IV, the level had increased to £7,675 annually. However, it would appear that during the latter years of James IV's reign, the increase in the income from justice ayres, escheats, remissions, respites and the chamberlain ayres was little short of dramatic. Unfortunately, the treasurers' accounts

---

107. The last reference to the chamberlain ayre occurred in 1517. TA, xii, xxvi.

108. TA, iv, 162-3.

109. The conviction of committing error in an inquest. The Practicks of sir James Balfour of Pittendreich, Stair Society, i, 287.

110. TA, i, 210, ii, 18.

for the years 1508 to 1511 have not survived, but during the year 1511-12, judicial compositions amounted to £13,574-18-3, a level unprecedented in previous accounts.[111] Although the following year could not boast of similar receipts, it is likely that the preparation for the invasion of England took priority over the execution of justice.[112]

A similar revolutionary change in the attitude of the crown towards feudal casualties was evident in both Scotland and England during the later Middle Ages. In England, the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries witnessed 'extensive efforts to exploit the fiscal aspects of feudalism to its maximum advantage'.[113] The period from the thirteenth to the mid fifteenth centuries saw a substantial decline in the value of the feudal incidents in England, mainly through the development of uses which primarily affected the valuable casualty of wardship. Although Edward IV, followed by Henry VII and his son Henry VIII, attempted to halt this continual drain of potential revenue, their efforts at retrenchment were inevitably limited to a series of indirect expedients which were nevertheless dominated by an acceptance of the existance and influence of uses. For instance, stringent efforts were undertaken to exploit to the full the feudal rights still remaining to the crown, the latter made considerable profit from the technical infringement of feudal rights, the heavy enforcement of which was associated with the careers of royal servants Empson and Dudley and, by means of Henry VII's statute of 1490 and the 1536 statute of Uses, efforts were made to retain the wardship of the body and the marriage of the heir, despite the fact that the entire estate had been conveyed to uses.

---

111. See Appendix No.B/9(a)

112. It would appear that the treasurer was not charged with the compositions from the justice ayres of 1512-3 (Pitcairn, 81-96), since the only submissions from this source consisted of rests from earlier accounts. TA, iv, 384-96.

113. Bean, The Decline of English Feudalism, 235.

However the crown's right to two thirds of the heir's lands in ward had been permanently lost in the Middle Ages.[114] In addition, in the period before the accession of Edward IV a considerable portion of the profit derived from feudal incidents was absorbed by the demands of royal patronage, for wardships and marriages were frequently granted freely or at reduced rates to courtiers, royal servants or influential magnates. In an effort to build up the financial, and consequently the political power, of the English monarchy, Edward IV realised the need to exploit fully the financial potential of feudal casualties.

In Scotland a not too dissimilar situation existed. During the fourteenth century and a large proportion of the fifteenth the potential profit from feudal incidents was effectively limited both by the inefficient and wasteful system of collection through the medium of the sheriff which had several disadvantages. Firstly the income was available in only yearly instalments for the duration of the ward or non-entry, with the result the crown was not able to extract the full profit from the incident until its termination, secondly the real income available to the crown from casualties levied by the sheriff or specially appointed baillies was reduced by such expenses as the widow's terce, the ecclesiastical tenth penny, the cost of the maintenance and upkeep of the heir and finally the financial inefficiency of many sheriffs must have affected the amount of real revenue that actually reached the royal coffers.

Although the Scottish crown did extract revenue from feudal casualties in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the demands of royal patronage absorbed a considerable portion of potential revenue from this

---

114. A fuller explanation of the history and development of feudal casualties throughout the entire Mediaeval period from 1215 is given in Bean's The Decline of English Feudalism.

source. As well as pensions and gifts of land, many royal servants and members of nobility benefitted from the donation of royal casualties as a means of rewarding loyal service to the crown and attracting political allies. During the period of royal weakness in the second half of the fourteenth century, several members of influential noble families seem to have extracted casualty concessions from the crown. On 3 April 1373 Alexander Stewart, lord of Badenoch was granted the entire relief due of the earldom of Lennox without any hint of a composition or any other payment for the gift.[115] Many powerful barons were able to secure what amounted to a remission of incidents due to the crown. On 27 March 1490 George Dunbar, son of the earl of March, a powerful and influential border magnate, was in receipt of a gift of the marriage, relief and wardship attached to the earldom of March and the lordship of Annandale with a remainder to his four brothers on George's death.[116]

Fifteenth century civil and financial records revealed a proliferation of gifts of feudal casualties, but seldom is there any indication of whether the concession was granted 'gratis' or whether a composition was levied and indeed if the composition was a realistic payment or merely a token submission. Valuable casualties were gifted by the crown, the ward of the lands of Carruthers, Dryfesdale and Turnmure, in the king's hands since the death of James Crichton, andcharged to the steward of Annandale at £200 annually, was granted to John Carlyle through letters under the privy seal of James II.[117] On 12 January 1463-4 William Douglas of Cluny, warden of the March, was gifted the ward of the lordships of Douglasdale and Tantallon, lands which had belonged to the late George, earl of Angus, for the duration

---

115. RMS, i, 557.

116. RMS, i, 800.

117. ER, vi, 273, 442. By 1471 the ward of the lands of Dryfesdale was valued at £3,100 which sum had not been collected by the sheriff of Dumfries as sir John Carlyle had been conceded the entire ward. ER, viii, 23.

of the ward.[118] There is no indication of payment to the crown for these and other valuable gifts during this period, but the fact that they were donated to royal supporters suggests that patronage played a significant role. In the 1454 account of the steward of Annandale, the accountant was allowed the ward of the lands of Dronnok since a composition had been arranged but he was also allowed £140 for the thirteen and a half year ward of the lands of Langrigs and Hodholme since the cash had been remitted to John Lindsay, the heir to the estates, 'pro servicio suo impendendo'.[119] However, although Edmund Hay submitted a composition of £46-13-4 to the comptroller in 1450 for the ward of the lands of Polgavy and Tealing, formerly possessed by William Maxwell, on 9 December 1449 Edmund and his wife received a gift of the marriage of a certain William Maxwell of Tealing, which seems to have been 'gratis.'[120]

The meagre evidence which is available for the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries suggests that many valuable feudal casualties were alienated by the crown in the interests of patronage. However, from the early fifteenth century, the employ of a composition as a means of obtaining the profits from a feudal casualty was in evidence. In the 1450 account of comptroller, Alexander Napier, William, bishop of Glasgow, submitted £50-6-8 for the marriage of Mary Normaville, one of the heirs to the lands of Gargunnock, the lord of Leslie paid a composition of 200 marks for the ward of his lands within the barony of Kincardine, while Reginald Uldeny negotiated a composition of £43-4s for the ward of his lands within the barony of Kingedward.[121] However, it was during the reign of James III

---

118. RMS, ii, 774.

119. ER, v, 670.

120. ER, v, 393. RMS, ii, 290.

121. ER, v, 395.

and more especially under his son, James IV, that compositions were used as the principal means of exploiting the financial potential of feudal incidents.

From at least the reign of James II, compositions were used as a method for raising the profit from incidents of ward, relief, non-entry and marriage. Under that monarch the extent of the composition was fixed by the royal Council,[122] but during the reign of James IV Compositors assisted the treasurer in this task.[123] During the majority of the fifteenth century, most of the feudal casualties were collected by the sheriff, but sometime before 1500, much of the responsibility for their collection had passed out of the hands of that officer and instead, feudal incidents tended to be sold for a composition paid directly to the treasurer.[124] Since the sheriffs had revealed a distinct reluctance to account for these receipts and as they were notoriously unreliable and frequently dishonest revenue collectors, the incentive for the extensive employment of the composition as a means of collecting the revenue from feudal casualties rested with the desire, especially on the part of James IV, to exploit this source of revenue to the full. Although in fact the sheriff was removed from the physical collection these casualties, the total value of various wards, non-entries and reliefs continued to be charged to him in his accounts, according to the details registered in the Responde Books. However, this was no more than paper work as the actual responsibility for their collection had passed to the treasurer. The majority of the casualties charged to the sheriff within his account were automatically discharged on the production of the letter of gift or an extract from the Privy Seal Register.[125]

---

122. ER, v, 295, 394.

123. TA, i, 313. For explanation of the nature of these casualties, see the chapter on the accounts of the sheriffs.

124. ER, xi, 319, 348, 369, 376, 384.

125. ER, xi, 325, 332, 344.

However, until 1509, compositions for gifts of feudal casualties produced at the Exchequer continued to be charged to the treasurer as part of his receipts from the sheriff. Inevitably such a situation led to confusion and a degree of overlapping, for, in 1508 a £50 composition of William Mudy was allowed to the treasurer, the abbot of Dunfermline, since 'the comptar is chargeit double, that is to say be his buke of compositions and be the rollis in the Schiref comp of Forfar'.[126]

In the reigns prior to that of James IV, if the retour of service stated that the lands in question were held in chief of the king, a precept of sasine was transmitted to the appropriate sheriff, ordering him to infeft the heir and take security for the casualties due, the amount of which was based on the findings of the inquest. A note of the precept was entered in the Responde Books and the sheriff was charged in his account according to these entries. However, James IV found it more expedient and, in the long run, more profitable to sell feudal casualties to the highest bidder. The selling of feudal incidents, either to the heir or to an outsider, was not only a suitable method for exploiting casualties but also a considerable administrative saving. Apart from removing the sheriff from the physical collection of the revenue, the composition provided the treasurer with a calculable total of real income against which no allowances were usually set.[127] As the composition was a sum arrived at in conjunction with the grantee and it was, therefore, more likely that full payment would be forthcoming, barring any royal remission. In addition, the onus and responsibility for the collection of the actual farms and profits shifted from the crown to the grantee, which not only reduced the volume of administration performed by royal officials but also removed such burdens as terces, second tithes

---

126. TA, iv, 140.

127. Although the gross value of a casualty could be calculated annually by the sheriff or the royal baillie the real income from such a source might vary considerably according to the extent of allowances.

and other expenses from royal consideration. Payment was due immediately after the gift had received royal approval, and although it was usually submitted in instalments, the crown usually received the full amount in advance of the more traditional method. Further, the sheriff or 'Ballivi ad extra' was given no incentive to extract the fullest amount of profit from the casualty, but when the grantees margin of profit depended on efficient exploitation and collection of the cash concerned with the incident, a far greater degree of efficiency was probably evident. The casualty was sold as a gift for which a composition or lump sum was due. The extent of the payment was settled by an agreement between the grantee on the one hand and the treasurer and the Compositors on the other. The oompositions were then recorded in the 'buke of compositione'.[128] Although these books of compositions have not survived for the reign of James IV, many settlements were recorded in the Register of the Privy Seal. The composition was inevitably less than the gross value of the casualty, as recorded in the Responde books.

There is considerable obscurity surrounding the exact method by which these compositions were assessed. It would appear that compositions for the gift of wards, non-entries, reliefs and marriages were settled by the open market. In January 1595-6 instructions to the Exchequer stated that casualties were to be granted to 'sik personis as sall pay and delyver greatest sowmes of money and satisfactioun theirof, swa that he wha payis maist to the kingis weill and profeitt sall be preferrit to all uthers, notwithstanding ony consanguinitie, affinitie or uther caussis whatsumevir'.[129] There is no reason to suggest that a similar principal was not in operation a century earlier. However, the extent of the composition was determined by a variety of factors, the value of the land involved according to the 'new

---

128. TA, iv, 140.

129. Acts of Council (Public Affairs), 265.

extent', the condition and fertility of the actual land, the nature of the casualty involved, the expected duration of the ward or non-entry, and that it did not lie in waste, the potential value of the gift of marriage as regards the status and inheritance of the heir and several other factors.

James III and IV still used feudal incidents as a vehicle for patronage and reward as well as for profit. In 1509 James Douglas, heir of William Douglas of Cavers, was granted the ward of his lands in the barony of Cavers and the free disposition of his own marriage for 'the gude and thankful service done to the kingis hienes be umquhile the said Williame, quhilk deit in defens of his realme and resisting of his inimies of Ingland and rebellis'.[130] It is perhaps reasonable to assume that many of the casualties gifted under royal letters issued under the great seal and some of those issued under the privy seal were, in fact, donated to the recipient as a form of patronage. In 1471 sir Archibald Dundas was granted freedom from ward for his lands of Dundas and Echeling should the baronies of Winchburgh and Drummaning fall into the king's hands through ward and relief while six years later John, lord Carlyle was permitted to appoint his own assignee to control the ward and marriage of his heir should he not be of age on John's death, both concessions were granted under the great seal.[131] On 14 June 1501 Alexander, earl of Huntly, received a royal letter of gift of the relief due from all his estates held for the service of ward and relief within the shires of Aberdeen and Banff for which he was bound to submit a composition. However, on 27 October the royal rentals mentioned that the earl held the lease of extensive property within the earldom of Moray which had still years 'left to run' but, at the king's request, the earl consented to surrender them to Janet Kennedy, lady of Bothwell and, as compensation,

---

130. RSS, i, 1862.

131. RMS, 1048, 1319.

he was remitted the composition due for his relief except the 160 marks which he had already paid to the treasurer.[132] Nevertheless, the principal motive behind the gifting of feudal incidents was profit, the desire to augment the treasurer's income through the systematic exploitation of these royal casualties so that the latter was able to absorb the vast expense of the king's shipping, building and military programmes. Clearly, during the reign of James IV there was a dramatic increase in the exploitation of the crown's feudal casualties. Between 1497 and 1500, letters issued under the privy seal recording such gifts averaged twelve a year, but, between the years 1507 and 1511, the average number of letters had risen to twenty eight annually.[133] To the recipient, the composition payment for the concession of a particular feudal incident was an investment. In return for a lump payment, the grantee was entitled to 'occupy and intromet with the sade landis ... and to rase and dispone apoun the malis and dewiteis thairof to thare proffit ... and als to mak bailzies, constable, wachmen and all uther officiaris nedfull ... and to hald court and playnt, with unlawis for the gude rewle of the samyn'.[134] Being an investment, every effort was made to ensure that the grantee was able to derive a profit from his gift. Considerable powers were associated with the casualty, the right to lease the lands,[135] 'to tak up the birum malez and proffitis'[136] the power to occupy the lands with the grantee's own goods,[137] if necessary, to distrain defaulters and to assign or dispose tenants.[138] Although it was in the interest of future sales that purchaser of a feudal incident

---

132. RSS, i, 730.

133. RSS, i, entries for the reign of James IV. Each year was regarded as starting on 1 January and ending on 31 December.

134. RSS, i, 1519.

135. RSS, i, 2143.

136. RSS, i, 2084.

137. RSS, i, 1779, 1822, 1844.

138. RSS, i, 1111.

should find his investment profitable, the principal concern of the crown was to ensure that the composition was submitted in full to the treasurer. Although entitled to the full profits of the estate, certain conditions were promulgated to ensure that neither the lands nor the heirs suffered permanent damage or loss during the temporary occupation. In a letter of gift, it was stated that the grantees were bound to 'kepand the saidis hous waterticht as efferis and sustenand the honest cost and nuresing of the thre bairnnis heretouris of the samyn all the said tyme of the ward.[139]

The apparent willingness of most classes of society to invest in gifts of feudal casualties suggests that the profits were sufficient to ensure the popularity of the scheme. Investors included most of the nobility, who compounded for the casualties of both large and small landowners,[140] most of the other landholding sections of lay society, who invested according to their means, some of the leading ecclesiastics, including Andrew, bishop of Moray,[141] John, prior of Coldingham,[142] and James, archbishop of Glasgow,[143] and even royal household officials, namely Robert Douglas of the wine cellar, John Kirkwood of the king's larder, and Andrew Wood of the king's chamber.[144] Although the majority of the grantees were outside the family whose lands were in ward or non-entry, most belonged to the same locality. The gift of non-entry of the lands of the barony of Kirkurd in the shire of Peebles was granted to Patrick, earl of Bothwell, whose sphere of influence was close at hand.[145] The evidence suggests that the selling of casualties was

---

139. RSS, i, 1519.

140. RSS, i, 1657, 1845, 1939, 2005, 2065. TA, ii, 13, 183, 184.

141. RSS, i, 1658, 1680. TA, ii, 181.

142. RSS, i, 1904.

143. RSS, i, 2354.

144. RSS, i, 208, 381, 402.

145. RSS, i, 1037. The lands of Kirkurd were the possession of the late David Scott of Buccleuch.

performed mainly on an economic basis, with the relatives of a deceased landowner seldom gaining any priority over outsiders. However, certain relatives were willing to invest in family ventures, for Cuthbert, earl of Glencairn purchased the ward and marriage of the heir of sir Adam Cunningham of Caprington in February 1507-8[146] and it was not uncommon for a widow to purchase the wardship and marriage associated with her son.[147]

It was usual to associate the casualties of wardship and marriage under the same composition. Its all embracing nature ensured its popularity, for not only did the recipient of the gift receive all the profits of the lands owned by the minor for the duration of the ward but he also retained the right to arrange the marriage of the heir, with an eye to material advantage. Such concessions were not purchased cheaply; in 1505, Patrick, earl of Bothwell paid £1,600 to the treasurer as a composition for the ward and marriage of the heir of Walter Scott of Branxholm, and Andrew, bishop of Moray submitted a composition of £1,000 for similar concessions concerning the heir of James Rutherford.[148] As well as the value of the lands, the extent of the composition for the gift of wardship was largely dependant on the length of the heir's minority, in other words the potential duration of the grantees control over the lands and also the extent of the competition for the concession. These are possible explanations for the wide variations in the size of compositions, which saw the ward and marriage of the heir of Hugh Wallace of Craigie fetch £1,866-13-4, whereas that of the laird of Tinwald was sold for only 300 marks and that of the laird of Fintry for £500.[149] Although the relationship between the gross value of the lands and the extent of the composition must have varied greatly, in 1501 the

---

146. RSS, i, 1605.

147. RSS, i, 1250, 1731, 2427.

148. TA, ii, 181, 183.

149. TA, i, 221-2, iii, 24.

lands of Tinwald had been in the king's ward for four years and the gross farms totalled £266-13-4. However the ward was gifted by the king to Patrick Crichton of Cranstone Riddell for a composition of £200 which he paid to the treasurer four years previous.[150] The value of the casualty as displayed in the Responde Book and in the sheriff's charge represented the gross assessment, based on the figures quoted in the retour of service, but such figures were frequently affected by certain allowances or errors in the findings of the inquest. It was not uncommon for the retour valuation to be below the true assessment of the lands concerned to the detriment of the crown but to the advantage of the grantee, who could extract large profits from the estate while paying an undervalued composition to the treasurer.[151] However, an artificially low estimation of land worth adversely affected the grantee of a relief whose profit margin was based on one year's annual rent. Thus, in 1490 Patrick, earl of Bothwell, instigated judicial proceedings against the jury which had served on the inquest on the lands of George, earl of Rothes, since they had assessed the annual value of the property at £275 when, in fact, the lands were found to be worth a total of £613-6-8.[152] Such an error worked to the disadvantage of both grantee and crown. It is, therefore, misleading to contrast the size of the gross valuation with the composition and extremely difficult to estimate the bargain achieved by purchaser of a casualty gift. Investment in wardship required considerable capital and some grantees were forced into association with other persons to offset the initial cost. On 8 January 1498-9, the ward and marriage of the heir of the late James

---

150. ER, xi, 314.

151. For details of inquests and retours of service, see the chapter on the Sheriffs' Accounts.

152. ADC, i, 154

Rutherford was granted to sir Robert Ker, but by 25 October 1500, sir Robert had died, and his son Andrew, probably unable to afford the expense of the gift incorporated Walter Ker or Cessford and Randolph Ker into the investment.[153] Inability or unwillingness to pay the composition demanded by the king for the gift of the ward of McLellan of Gileston may have been the motivation behind its sudden transfer from Archibald, earl of Angus to Ninian McCulloch of Gardoness[154] on 28 November. Also, the receiver of a royal wardship was entitled to regrant the gift to an assignee, who then paid the original grantee for the concession. It was possible, of course, to purchase the rights of wardship without the additional gift of marriage. In 1500 Elizabeth Gray, widow of John, lord Glammis, paid a £300 composition for the right of the wardship of her late husband's lands within the sheriffdoms of Perth and Forfar and a further £200 for similar rights on the death of her son George, lord Glammis, five years later.[155] However, the right of the marriage of George, lord Glammis was purchased not by Elizabeth Gray, but by Alexander, Earl of Huntly and later by the earl of Argyll.[156] Investment in the wardship and marriage of the sons of burgesses were also recorded in the treasurer's charge, a composition of £50 was paid by William Scott in 1507 for the casualties related to the heir of Walter Ogilvy of Montrose, while, four years earlier, Richard Lawson and James Henderson submitted a composition of £200 for the ward and marriage of the heir of Andrew Bertram, burgess of Edinburgh.[157] Although the majority of casualties were sold for cash, on 7 November 1509 master Walter Ogilvy was gifted the ward of the lands of Newtown in the

---

153. RSS, i, 351, 585.

154. RSS, i, 600, 603. Both letters were dated 28 November and the transfer was enacted through 'the consent of my Lord of Angus'.

155. TA, ii, 13, iii, 23. RSS, i. 1109. George, lord Glammis died in 1505 while still a minor.

156. RSS, i, 973, 1166.

157. TA, ii, 14, iii, 24.

earldom of Buchan and as payment Ogilvy temporarily surrendered his right to an annual pension of 20 marks with full regress to the annuity on the termination of the ward.[158]

It was not uncommon for the casualty of marriage to be sold independantly from the ward. The purchase of rights of marriage might also be an expensive commodity for John Dunbar of Mochrum paid a composition of £466-13-4 to the treasurer for the marriage of Alexander Stewart, heir of Stewart of Dalswinton.[159] A gift of the marriage of Laurence Oliphant, heir of the laird of Aberdalgy, or, on his death, that of his brother James, cost David Hay of Lochorwart a composition of 600 marks under the terms laid down in a royal gift under the great seal of James II in March 1450-1.[160] Outsiders often invested in the marriage rights of wealthy heirs as it provided an excellent opportunity to extend the family estates. However, such rights were also sold to the heir himself when he came of age or to members of his own family in order to maintain the property within the family. The desire to preserve the family fortune was probably the motivation behind a composition of £133-6-8 submitted by Patrick Agnew for the rights of his own marriage, thus leaving him free to marry to his own advantage and not at the dictates of another.[161] Although the majority of gifts of marriage were confined to the direct male or female heir of a deceased landholder, many charters of gift issued under the privy seal recorded alternatives in the event of the original heir dying after the concession had been issued and paid for. In 1495, Hugh, lord Montgomery

---

158. RSS, i, 1949.

159. TA, ii, 15.

160. SRO, Calander of Yester Writs, GD 28/96

161. TA, ii, 181.

received the gift of the marriage of John Kennedy, heir of John Kennedy of Culzean with the added note that 'quhilkis falezeand be his deceis, the marriage of the are or aris males or female quhatsumever succedant to the said umquhile Johns heritage'.[162] Having paid a composition for the right of marriage, the grantee was in a position either to marry the heir or heiress into his own family, with the possibility of territorial expansion, or else allow the marriage of the transferred to an outsider for financial reimbursement. The destiny of the marriage of the heirs of John, lord Glammis adequately revealed the fluid nature of the market in feudal casualties. On 17 August 1503, the gift of the marriage of his heir, George was gifted first to Alexander, earl of Huntly with the usual alternatives in the event of George's death. However, on 24 November 1505, the gift was regranted to Archibald, earl of Argyll, who in March 1508-9 'assignit and disponit of the sammny' to William, earl Marischal 'for ane soume of money pait and to be pait to the said earl of ergile'.[163] The flaunting of these marriage rights by the heir or heiress was severely dealt with. On 5 July 1483, the Lords Auditors decreed that Alexander, lord Forbes was to pay the sum of 2,000 marks, twice the value of his marriage, to Margaret, lady Dirleton, who had been gifted the right of his marriage by James III, on his refusal to marry her daughter as requested.[164] In March 1498-9, John Dunbar of Mochrum pursued an action against Patrick Clugston of that ilk for the illegal postponing of the latter's marriage with Elizabeth Dunbar, John's brother's daughter and the defendant was

---

162. RSS, i, 58.

163. RSS, i, 973, 1166, 1845. By the latter grant, George had died, and the gift of marriage was now of his brother, John, now lord Glammis.

164. ADA, 113. The Antiquities of the shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 408. On 13 October 1483, the lords accepted the assessment of the value of the marriage at 1,000 marks and Alexander, lord Forbes was compelled to pay double the value at 2,000 marks to Lady Dirleton. ADA, 121. Lord Forbes seems to have married Margaret Boyd, daughter of Thomas, earl of Arran. Paul, The Scots Peerage, iv, 53.

ordered to pay the single value of the gift to John as a penalty.[164] Efforts were made not only to defraud the grantee of the gift of marriage, but also the king from the profit of such gifts. On 7 March 1498-9 William Carnis of Orchetton was summoned for the illegal contraction of marriage with Christin McLellan, daughter of the laird of Bomby, when the laird was on his deathbed and thereby defrauding the king of the profit of the marriage.[165]

It was usual for the casualty to relief to be granted in association with gifts of ward or non-entry.[166] Many landowners, for whom the casualty of relief was the only one liable, tended to compound with the treasurer for a sum less than the prescribed year's rental. In 1507 George, lord Seaton contributed £433-6-8 to the treasurer, James, abbot of Dunfermline, as part payment of the total composition of £900 for the relief of his lands.[167]

Although the casualty of non-entry was certainly not a new innovation by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it was certainly more heavily exploited by James IV than previous monarchs. Concerning the casualty, Balfour stated that 'gif ane air of landis be of lauchful age, and thairfoir havand power to enter to his landis, lyis out un-enterit to the samin, the landis are in non-entres all the time and space that he lyis out unenterit ... propter negligentiam heredis, non recuperantis jus suum'.[168] By remaining 'unenterit' in the landed property, the landholder therefore avoided the payment of certain feudal incidents and also the cost of purchasing a charter

---

164. ADC, ii, 334. The marriage was valued at £100. A composition for 50 marks was received by the treasurer from John Dunbar on 15 September 1497 for the marriage of the laird of Clugston.

165. ADC, ii, 335.

166. RSS, i, 1800, 1839, 2003, 2153, 2170.

167. TA, iv, 12.

168. Balfour, Practicks, i, 257.

of infeftment from the king. In a similar position to Edward IV of England, if James IV was to be successful in substantially increasing the revenue derived from feudal incidents and also in halting the erosion of crown rights it was essential payment for technical infringements of the feudal law were stringently applied.[169] James IV was determined to clamp down on the failure of certain persons to gain legal infeftment to their estates and forcefully exercised the casualty of non-entry for that purpose. The intention was not to deprive the landholder of his estate, but to compel him to pay a composition in order to gain a legal title to his lands. In fact, the exploitation of the casualty of non-entry under James IV was little more than an administrative device, designed to reinforce the crown's rights which had tended to lapse in previous reigns. Although James I must have been aware of the financial potential of the casualty of non-entry,[170] it was James IV who converted it into a financial reality. There is evidence that James III was aware of the possibilities of the exaction of the casualty of non-entry but it was never exploited to its full potential. On 23 July 1473 a retour served John, lord Darnley heir to half the estates of Duncan, earl of Lennox, the lands being valued at £60 annually. Being, therefore, in non-entry since the execution of earl Duncan forty eight years ago, the crown was legally entitled to reclaim lost farms to the tune of £2,880 and in the instrument of sasine security was to be taken for £250 in order to relieve the casualty.[171] The diminutive nature of the composition may be explained by the fact that Andrew, lord Avandale held a liferent grant of the earldom from James III.

---

169. Bean, The Decline of English Feudalism, 256.

170. Hist. MSS, Comm., 14th Report, App. Part iii, duke of Roxburgh, No. 17.

171. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 96-7. On 3 July James III issued a discharge to lord Darnley of all compositions due from his entry to half the earldom of Lannox. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 100.

An ideal reflection of crown policy towards non-entry is perhaps best demonstrated in the case of the lands of the barony of Kirriemuir. On 17 June 1510 a decree of the Lords of the Council in response to a royal summons was passed against Archibald, earl of Angus 'as alleged tenant to the crown of the lands of the barony of Kirriemuir', the lands of Authebeaton and other lands specified therein' which were declared to be in the crown's hands through non-entry for the preceeding 45 years, namely since the death of the late George, earl of Angus.[172] Legally earl Archibald was not entitled to the rents and other profits from Kirriemuir since the death of earl George since he and his predecessors had never sought infeftment to the barony which, in theory, remained in the king's hands as feudal superior during the period of this technical lapse. Although the earl of Angus retained actual possession of the lands in question during the stated 45 years, the crown was now reasserting its right to the farms for those years, assessed at £1,000 annually. Thus, in theory, the crown claimed a total of £45,000, the 'by-run' rents of the lands in question as they had not been occupied legally during that period. But since the crown could not expect the earl to be able to produce such a large sum of money and since the king was also reluctant to deprive him of his right to the barony, a compromise settlement was concluded. On 1 August 1510 a royal charter was issued under the great seal stating that 'because the said maills were of greater value that all those lands' and since the king was unwilling to disinherit earl Archibald, the latter was granted a new infeftment of the lands for a certain composition payable to the treasurer. Also the lands in question were erected into a free barony and the earl was granted the privilege of giving infeftment by charter and sasine to the free tenants of the barony.[173] The full extent of the composition was set at 5,000 marks and in the 1512 account of

---

172. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 194-5.

173. Ibid, iii, 195-6. RMS, ii, 3489.

treasurer Andrew, bishop of Caithness, £649 was received as part payment of £1,446, the rest of the composition payable for the charter of new infeftment of the barony of Kirriemuir.[174] The final £510 was remitted by the king to Archibald, earl of Angus, sir Robert Graham of Fintry, sir Henry Lovell of Ballumby and William Carmichael. This remission revealed that even the composition was not paid in full by the earl of Angus. In addition, contributions were received from the free tenants of the barony.[175] For instance, on the 10 December 1511, James IV confirmed a charter of the earl of Angus which granted anew to sir Henry Lovell of Ballumby his portion of the lands within the regality of Kirriemuir, sir Henry having paid his portion of the composition mentioned above.[176] When the superior compounded with the treasurer for the non-entry of both his property and tenandries, the entire payment was recorded in the name of the superior with the various free tenants making their contributions according to the extent of their holdings. However, in the case of the barony of Kingedward, the various free tenants were compelled to settle directly with the crown. Despite the fact that the barony had been granted by John, lord of the Isles to James, earl of Buchan in 1490, in 1503 the Lords of the Council adjudged that the barony was the property of the crown on the grounds of non-entry since the death of John, earl of Buchan, the son of Robert, duke of Albany, in 1424. Since the rights of superiority were not recovered the various free tenants of the barony were compelled to compound separately with the king's treasurer in order to secure a legal title to their estates, now held of the crown as the apex of the feudal system. Several royal

---

174. TA, iv, 155-6. The full compositions was quoted in the preceeding account of the treasurer, unfortunately lost. A further £296 was paid through an assignation of the treasurer to master Thomas Dickson for certain expenses sustained by him and allowed, through a royal mandate, in the previous account. S.R.O. Treasury precepts, receipts, E.23/5.

175. RMS, ii, 1081, 1538, 1559, 1560.

176. RMS, ii, 3664.

confirmations and new infeftments were granted under the great seal for which compositions were extracted. On 16 August 1503 Henry Mercer submitted £200 to the treasurer for a charter of new infeftment of his holdings of Faithlie and Tiry within the barony while on 10 November William, earl Marischal paid a composition of 100 marks for confirmation of his estate of Pittinbla and Pittindrum.[177] Many other free tenants were forced to settle with the treasurer in order to maintain their tenancies and between July 1503 and January 1505-6 a total of £631-13-4 was charged to the treasurer for this purpose.[178] There can be little doubt that the resurrection of the casualty of non-entry could be a heavy burden on landowners who had been lax in their attention to legal details, for, as well as the above example of the barony of Kirriemuir, the earl of Angus was, at the same time, to settle with the crown for the non-entry and relief of his lordship of Eskdale, for which the crown laid claim to a total of 66,000 marks for past farms.[179] Further, in the first few years of the sixteenth century, part of the lands of Gilmerton were found to have been in non-entry for the previous sixty years, namely since the death of William Somerville, and had been illegally occupied by John, lord Somerville and his predecessors through which the crown claimed past farms totalling 2,790 marks. However, the lands in question were regranted to sir John Somerville of Cambusnethan on the payment of compositions, both by the latter and his free tenants, of at least £693-6-8.[180] Again, a satisfactory

---

177. RMS, ii, 2744, 2754. TA, ii, 33, 177.

178. RMS, ii, 2732, 2736, 2744, 2747, 2748, 2754, 2755, 2869, 2898, 2902, 2912. TA, ii, 33, 177, iii, 18, 19.

179. ADC, xxi, f 196.

180. RMS, ii, 2774. TA, ii, 175, 190. Payments were as follows:-
£160 composition submitted by John Ramsey of Swynnisden.
£200 composition submitted by Patrick Hering.
500 marks composition submitted by sir John Somerville.

financial arrangements was arrived at between the crown and the landlord. In May 1511 Henry Mersar was compelled to compound for a charter of reinfeftment of the barony of Meikleour, the lands of Balleif and others in the sheriffdoms of Perth and Kinross, for, since the lands had been incorporated into a free barony during the minority of James II they had therefore suffered under the subsequent revocation, thus leaving them in non-entry for a total of 40 years and a debt of £4,460 was owing to the crown for the farms of that period.[181] From the crown's point of view, the employment of technicality of non-entry was, in the majority of cases, merely a device to force the tenant in chief to seek a new infeftment of all or part of his estate, for which he submitted a composition to the treasurer. Although the composition was often considerably smaller than the accumulated farms of the non-entry period, the crown was content to settle for the smaller sum in the interests of practicality since the full assessment would have proved an intolerable financial burden.

The unwillingness or inability of certain landowners to fulfil the payment of their compositions for various feudal casualties was a common occurrence. Persistent refusal to submit the full composition for wardship, relief, non-entry or marriage, forced the crown to issue letters to the local sheriff ordering him to distrain either the moveable goods, or failing that, a portion of the lands of the defaulter in order to offset the loss in revenue.[182] After the lands had been apprized, a particular portion, according to the size of the debt, fell to the crown in recompense for the money owed. The fate of these lands was decided by the king. Occasionally the threat of poinding encouraged the landholder to settle with the king. On 2 May 1510 the lands of Petfour, Petcowok and Drumgreen were apprized to

---

181. RMS, ii, 3572.

182. RMS, ii, 2619, 2620, 2638, 2840, 2932, 3310, 3454.

the king for a debt of 14,00 marks, the total farm from forty years non-entry, but by 24 May the lands had been recovered by the earl of Crawford and John Cochran through payment made to the treasurer.[183] However, more commonly, the king granted the apprized lands to an outsider who in return submitted a composition to the treasurer for the concession, leaving the original owner the right of regress on the repayment of the composition to the outsider. In this way the crown ensured reasonably prompt payment of the composition whether payment was derived from the original owner or a third party investing in the debt. On 13 August 1502, the lands of Symonstone were apprized to the crown for a debt of £446-7s, the aggregate farm of the thirteen years non-entry of sir William Colville of Ochiltree and were regranted to Robert Colville of Hilton, director of the chancery in return for the payment of a composition, until the debt was repaid. However, in this case, sir William Colville of Ochiltree eventually compounded with the treasurer and recovered his right to the lands under consideration.[184] Yet, on 16 May 1502, John, lord Flemming was granted possession of half of the lands of Cambusbaron 'with all malis and proffitis thairof of all termez and zeris bigane that thai haif bene in the handis of our soverane lord' through non-entry and 'for all termez tocum'. In return for the gift of the profits of the lands in question, lord Flemming submitted a composition of at least £66 to the treasurer, and he was entitled to retain possession of the estates until the rightful heir of David Flemming of Biggar, the original owner of the lands, was able to recover possession of them.[185]

---

183. RMS, ii, 3463. John Cochran was probably a free tenant of the arl of Crawford and in the charter of new infeftment the earl was granted the right to infeft Cochran in the lands held by him of the earl.

184. TA, iii, 16. RMS, ii, 3331. The composition of £300 included the lands of Bernwell.

185. RSS, i, 823. TA, ii, 16.

In 1512 sir David Hume of Wedderburn received a royal charter of half the lands of Hartshaw in Berwickshire, which belonged to sir Patrick Hume of Polworth with the condition that Patrick's heir should have full regress to the halflands on payment to the grantee of 'as much cash as he or his father had paid for the same'.[186] The custumary non-entry grant detailed the following conditions, that the grantee was entitled to the gift of all future terms until the entry of the heir, the power to collect all 'birum malez, and to apprize 'the grond for the sammyn'.[187]

The efficient pursuing of feudal casualties by the crown under James IV was designed not so much to cripple the feudal baronage, but to ensure that the crown derived the maximum profit from its legitimate rights. However, the efficient and persistent exaction of feudal casualties from George, earl of Rothes resulted in the steady alienation of the earl's landed estate, portions of which were granted away in response to the earl's repeated refusal to entertain any financial settlement with the crown. Under the terms of the Council decision of 3 March 1507-8, the lands of the barony of Balmain, the property of George, earl of Rothes, were found to have been in non-entry for at least twenty six years since the death of George Leslie and as the earl was unwilling to compound with the treasurer for the accumulated farms amounting to £2,210, James IV granted the entire barony, in May 1510, to sir John Ramsey of Terrenzeane in fee.[188] In this way, the crown did not lose out, for instead of compounding with Rothes for the casualty, the treasurer now received a composition from Ramsey for his infeftment to

---

186. RSS, i, 2381.

187. RSS, i, 2084.

188. Hist. MSS, Comm., 4th Report, App., earl of Rothes, 497-8. ADC, xixi, f 198, 238. RMS, ii, 3460. However, between the Council decision and the grant to Ramsey, the lands of Balmain were accounted on behalf of the crown by Thomas, lord Innermeath as baillie, between October 1508 and July 1509. ER, xiii, 195-6.

the lands of Balmain.[189] On 22 October 1490, the lords of the Council decreed that the earl of Rothes was to submit a total £870 and 46 chalders of victuals to Patrick, earl of Bothwell, who had been granted a royal gift of the relief and non-entry of his lands, but since Rothes had failed to comply with the terms of the gift, his lands were to be distrained.[190] Through the levying of the casualties of non-entry and recognition coupled with the earl of Rothes' reluctance to compound with the treasurer for these incidents, a large proportion of the lands of the barony of Ballinbreich were apprized to the crown and subsequently regranted to others in return for a composition. Many of the free tenants of the barony were forced to compound on their own account for the lands which they had held of the earl. In 1511, John Gordon, son of George Gordon of Quisny, as assignee of Robert Lummisden of Maidlare and also the latter on his own behalf, each paid a composition of 300 marks to the treasurer for a fresh infeftment of their lands in the barony of Quisny, previously annexed to the barony of Ballinbreich, since they now held their lands of the king and when the earl of Rothes should recover his right to the barony of Ballinbreich, the above tenants were to be reinfeft without the payment of any further composition.[191] A considerable portion of the property of the earl was regranted by the crown, in 1510 222 marks (new extent) of land in the barony of Ballinbreich had been apprized to the crown and was conceded to Andrew Barton as security for the earl's debt of £1,065-6-8 to the king.[192] The earl's refusal to arrange a financial settlement with the treasurer for the clearing of these casualties resulted in the alienation of a considerable portion of his

---

189. TA, iv, 151. The only record of the composition was 100 marks which were not charged to the treasurer, the bishop of Caithness in 1512.

190. ADC, i, 153.

191. RMS, ii, 3536, 3592, 3593. TA, iv, 157.

192. RMS, ii, 3511. No record of Andrew Barton's composition in the treasurer's accounts.

property. However, although the earl of Rothes had lost his right to much of the property of the barony of Ballinbreich, on the 14 July 1513, James IV, on the basis of a decision of 31 March, declared that William Leslie, brother and heir of earl George, could redeem the lands of the barony on the payment of 2,000 marks to the treasurer, of which 1,400 marks had been paid by the earl before his death.[193] In an additional letter under the privy seal, William Leslie received from James IV all right to the non-entry, farms and profits of the lands of the barony of Ballinbreich, except those of the tenancies for which the king arranged a prior settlement.[194] By 1 April 1517 the property barony of Ballinbreich which had belong to George, earl of Rothes and which had been sold to Andrew Barton for casualty debts, was recovered by Margaret Crichton, wife of George, fourth earl of Rothes on payment of the original debt of £1,065-6-8 with an additional 200 marks made payable to Andrew's son, Alexander Barton.[195] Also in this charter, it was recorded that other alienated lands, namely the lands of Dunloppy through recognition and Balmain through non-entry, had been redeemed by the earl of Rothes. The plight of Rothes revealed not only that the crown was determined to extract its rightful feudal return, whether from the original landholder or from those willing to invest in the debt in order to gain temporary occupation of the lands in question, but also that failure to compound with the treasurer involved landowners like Rothes in a considerable loss of property. In addition, the investment by Andrew Barton in the debt of Rothes proved to be a profitable business arrangement, for, in return for the original outlay to the treasurer of £1,065 for the concession, Andrew Barton or his son extracted the rents valued at 222 marks (new extent) of the lands in question from 1510 and also received a bonus of 200 marks.[196]

---

193. Hist. MSS, Comm., 4th Report, Appendix, earl of Rothes, 503.

194. RSS, i, 2501.

195. RMS, iii, 148.

196. Reid, History of Robert Barton of Over Barnton, 116, 134-5.

On several occasions, the casualty was sold in anticipation. In 1502 William, lord Borthwick was granted the gift of the ward, relief, non-entry and marriage of Alexander Hume, sone and heir of lord Hume, 'gif it happinys him to deceis in his passage in Denmark, or ony tyme before that the said Alexander his son, or the are that sall happin to succeid til the said lordis heretage' and on the death of lord Hume under these conditions, the gift was to be renewed by the king without new cost.[197]

Only compositions which had been paid were entered in the treasurers' charge and those items which were remitted, discharged, assigned by the king or 'suppos thai pertenit to his office' were ignored.[198] Also, only that part of a composition that was paid within the duration of the account was entered in the charge and the remainder was carried forward to future accounts and forming part of the rest.[199] There is little doubt that the selling of feudal casualties for a composition increased dramatically during the reign of James IV, and, although large sums were entered in the treasurers' charge from this source, this revealed only part of the situation. Between February 1500-1 and the same month in 1504-5 compositions for feudal casualties totalled £11,320, between August 1506 to the same month in 1508 a total of £5,953 was received, while during the ten months between October 1512 and August 1513 the profit from incidents amounted to £3,067.[200] These figures do not represent the total income from casualty compositions for three principal reasons. Firstly, several casualty sales were still accounted for in the treasurers' receipts from the sheriffs, as explained above, and secondly, although several compositions

---

197. RSS, i, 832.

198. TA, i, 220-2.

199. TA, iii, 8-10, 216-7, 226-7.

200. See Appendix No. B/9(a)

for the gift of non-entry were recorded in this section, when the original owner compounded for the casualty, it frequently took the form of a charter of new infeftment, which tended to be included in the section dealing with charter compositions. Thirdly, the compositions for certain casualty gifts seem to have eluded the treasurers' charge. In the 1495-6 account of the abbot of Paisley a large quantity of compositions 'that fell within the time of the tresaurare' were, in fact, not entered in his charge.[201]

The treasurer was not charged with compositions due after his death[202] nor those subsequently assigned or remitted.[203] As with other compositions, the treasurer accepted bonds to offset the unavailability of ready cash. Compositions were mostly paid in instalments and as each portion was paid, the treasurer granted a discharge. Proof of payment to the treasurer was provided by issue of a letter of discharge, a form of receipt, by the treasurer to the subscriber for the amount transmitted. Since most compositions were paid in instalments, the full payment of a composition might involve the issuing of several such letters. On 25 June 1507 the treasurer, James, abbot of Dunfermline, confessed receipt of 100 marks 'of usual money of Scotland' from William, earl of Errol, as a composition for the ward of the lands of Vaux Burns and also for £60 as part payment of a composition for the relief and non-entry of the lands. At the end of the letter, the treasurer stated that 'we hold us content and pay in our soverane landis name quitclarnis and dischargis the said erle and all other tharof for now and ever be this acqictance'. On 5 July 1508 a similar discharge was issued to Errol in response to the additional payment of £112-5-5.[204] These sub-

201. TA, i, 220-2.

202. TA, ii, 184.

203. TA, i, 243-4.

204. SRO. Errol Charters, 221. TA, iv, 12.

missions were then recorded in the charge side of the treasurer's charge. This represented a form of insurance for the subscriber who was able to produce this letter should the payment be queried at a later date. On 16 June 1512, the treasurer, Andrew, bishop of Caithness issued a discharge to Thomas Boyle of Risholm for his submission of £26-13-4 in part payment of a composition for new infeftment to the lands of Risholm and also, by the special command of the king, Thomas was forgiven and remitted a further £26-13-4 and thus completing full payment of the composition.[205] Between 22 July 1511 and 17 February 1511-12, the treasurer issued five discharges to Robert Liddale and sir Thomas Maule of Panmure for the part payment of a composition for infeftment in the lands of Panlatly, within the regality of Kirriemuir, which was in non-entry.[206] Although payment was made in the name of the compounder, it need not be made by him personally. On 22 May 1512 Andrew, bishop of Caithness, as treasurer, granted a letter of acquittance or discharge for the sum of 100 marks, as part of the composition of James Arbuthnot for new infeftment to the barony of Arbuthnot and the letter stated that the actual payment had been made by master James Wishart on Arbuthnot's behalf.[207]

In order to combat the defaulters and reluctant debtors, penalty clauses were frequently inserted. Reluctance or inability to submit the full composition was a constant problem for the treasurer. On 4 February

---

205. SRO, Treasury Precepts and Receipts, E 23/1/6. TA, iv, 164. The bishop of Caithness in his account made a total receipt of £53-6-8 from Thomas Boyle and a further £26-13-4 was remitted to Thomas on account of his poverty.

206. Ibid, E 23/11 1-5. TA, iv, 156. Discharges were as follows:-

22 July 1511	£53-6-8
9 December	£24
22 December	£23-6-8
9 January 1511-12	£20
17 January	£24.

207. Miscellany of Spalding Club, ii, Arbuthnot Papers, 105-6.

1496-7 Anthony Keith was decreed by the Lords of the Council to pay the remaining 200 marks of a composition of 1,000 marks for the ward and marriage of lordship of Pitsligo within ten days and failing payment, the king was entitled to 'dispone apone the said warde and mariage til quhat persone or persons he plesis'. In the event of the latter occurrence, Keith was to be refunded only 300 marks of what he had already submitted to the treasurer, the remaining 500 marks was to be declared lost to the king 'becaus of the costis and expensis sustentit be the kingis hienes in the wanting of the soume abone expremyt'.[208] On 4 July 1511, Malcolm MacLeod of Lewis was granted a bond for the composition of 1786¾ marts for his non-entry and the marts were to be delivered to the haven of Stornoway within twenty days after each term of payment or when the ships came for them. However, failure to make the appropriate delivery was to result in the new infeftment of his lands being declared void and he was to 'renuncis the samyn to oure soverane lord for evirmare'.[209] Attempts were made to defraud not only the crown but also other claimants to gifts of feudal casualties. On 28 July 1511 master Alexander Ogilvy was recorded as having obtained the ward of the lands of Petgare from the archbishop of Glasgow, then treasurer, through falsely claiming the consent of Alexander Gardin of Petgare. The Council ordered Alexander Gardin to occupy the lands as before despite the gift since it was obtained through false information.[210] Also, on 11 March 1501-2 the king informed the lords of the Council that he had, on the advice of the treasurer, disposed of the non-entry of the lands of Sanquhar to Hugh Rose of Kilravock for a reasonable composition but was informed that Alexander Dunbar, heir of Cumnock, possessed another gift of the lands 'sinisterlie

208. ADC, ii, 66-7. TA, i, 220.

209. ADC, xxiii, f 10.

210. ADC, xxiv, f 75.

purchest wythoute ony compositioun making' and although the king and Rose agreed 'to be bundyn by way of compromit for dressing of the mater in friendlie maner', Dunbar pursued the matter before the lords of the Council. Despite the impression of the royal letter and the desire to settle the matter outside the court, on 15 January 1502-3 James Dunbar, son of the late Alexander received a gift, issued under the privy seal, of the relief and non-entry of £5 of land in Sanquhar which had belonged to James Urwell and for which he submitted a composition of £20 to the treasurer.[211]

The crown, in common with other superiors, was entitled to exact a payment or composition on the granting of a charter, whether to a crown vassal, a burgh or to a church or college.[212] The crown granted charters to its vassals for a variety of reasons; for new infeftments,[213] for charters of joint infeftment, which involved the joint association of the husband and wife in a grant of land with the survivor retaining a life tenure of the infeftment,[214] for royal confirmations of changes in land ownership,[215] charters of resignation,[216] and charters for the erection of particular estates into a barony.[217] In addition, compositions were levied for charters of leases and feus. On 17 March 1503-4, a composition of 500 marks was charged to the late Alexander Gordon of Midmar for a five year lease of the lands of Strathdee and Cromar,[218] while in the 1507 account of treasurer, James, abbot of Dunfermline, sir David Kennedy submitted £300 as part of a composition of 1,000 marks for a charter of the

---

211. Innes, Rose of Kilravock, 184. RSS, i, 898. TA, ii, 181.

212. TA, ii, 177, iii, 21, iv, 388.

213. TA, iii, 21, iv, 164.

214. TA, iii, 15, 230. RMS, ii, 2826.

215. TA, iii, 14.

216. TA, ii, 11.

217. TA, ii, 180, iv, 167.

218. TA, ii, 190. RSS, i, 1026, 1027.

feufarm of the lands of Leswalt.[219] The sale of offices, both hereditary and for a shorter period of time, were also a considerable source of income for the crown. Payment for the grant of an office occurred at the issuing of a charter of concession, and usually involved large compositions. In 1498, lord Montgomery paid £1,666-13-4 for the offices of baillie of Cunningham and chamberlain within the burgh of Irvine and sir James Dunbar of Cumnock submitted £500 to the treasurer for a grant of the office of sheriff of Elgin and Forres and of the castle hill of Forres.[220] It seems likely that the size of such compositions was determined by the prestige attached to the office, but the inherent competition between the Montgomeries and the Cunninghams over the former office may have helped to swell the composition. Concerning land charters, the extent of the composition was probably determined by the value of the lands concerned and there is no evidence of any fixed assessment as in the eighteenth century, when composition payment corresponded to one sixth of the valued rent.[221] As well as the value of the land, the size of a composition for a royal charter would seem to have been dependent on the type of the grant, for instance charters for royal confirmation of the transfer of private estates involved lower compositions than charters of new infeftment.

Charters of new infeftment were granted by the crown if the lands in question had reverted to the king under the terms of the casualties of non-entry or recognition. Since, in theory, the lands had passed out of the possession of the original holder to the crown, as the feudal superior, redemption from the crown was achieved only through the payment of a

---

219. TA, iii, 234. RMS, ii, 2954.

220. TA, i, 316.

221. Clerk and Scrope, Historical View of the Forms and Powers of the Court of Exchequer in Scotland, 187.

composition to the treasurer for the issuing of a royal charter. No deliberate attempt was made on the part of the crown to annex these lands. The levying of these casualties proved to be merely an administrative device designed to force the owner of the estate under consideration to seek a new, and legal infeftment of his holding. The financial effect of the efficient exploitation of the casualty of non-entry has been mentioned above and now a similar assessment of the effect of recognition should be undertaken.

Basically the term recognition involved the resumption of lands by the superior 'gif it happens the vassall, or possessour ... to committ ane fault or crime' and the same lands 'quhilkis were first propertie to him (the superior), and thereafter tennendrie, be reason of the alienation, nowe becomes againe propertie and returnis to their first nature and condition'.[222] However, as far as the accounts of the treasurer are concerned, the normal cause of recognition was the alienation, without royal licence, of more than half of an estate held by the serviece of ward and relief. The decree of recognition against sir John Stirling of Keir for the alienation of his lands of Lupno, Dauchlewan and Raterne Stirling provided a good example of the process of recognition. The decree stated that sir John and all others 'has tynt thar properte and possessioun thareof, and decernis the samny to pertene to oure soverane lord, and to be disponit at his plesoure, as his propire landis in tyne to cum: Because the maist part of the saidis landis is analyt without licence, consent, or confirmation of oure said soverane lord ... thai beand haldin immediately, be service of warde and releif ... For thw quhilk cause of alienatioun the saidis landis war recognisit in oure soverane Lordis handis, and nocht lattin to borch the space of zer and day efter the said recognitioun being bipast'.[223] Whether the landlord had alienated the whole or only over half of his estate the superior was entitled to resume the whole. As mentioned in the charter above, the

222. Skene, De Verborum Significatione, Recognition.

223. Fraser, The Stirlings of Keir, 298. RMS, ii, 3846.

vassal might ask that the lands be 'let to borgh' ro him, 'that is to repledge them, find and plege caution, that he sall be reddie to do to his superiour anent the saides lades, all that equitie and lawe requiris'.[224] Should the lands not be 'let to borgh', within a year and a day, as the case of sir John Stirling, they were forfeited. In 1498, the lords of the Council decided that the lands of Dempstarton and others did not fall under the casualty of recognition, and the king was advised to release the lands.[225] In 1506, the lords of the Council decided that one third of the lands of Newburgh, belonging to Alexander, lord Erskine, ought not to be recognised by James IV into the barony of Newburgh since there was charter evidence that they had been united into the barony of Kelly.[226]

Of all the feudal casualties, the process of recognition seems to have attracted the most attention. Buchanan, dealing with the reign of James IV, claimed that an empty treasury forced the king to employ new methods to augment royal income, and among others 'one proposed, it is generally believed, by William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, which was very oppressive to the whole nobility'. He was referring to the process of recognition, which, after a description of its principal features, Buchanan continued, 'this law, which had lain long dormant, as unjust, and enacted by court parasites, for readily filling the exchequer, the king was advised to revive, as he would be able to raise some money from those who had violated it, by a process they called recognition. This method of exacting money, although it did not deprive any person of their whole estate, being of more

---

224. ADC, i, 22. Fraser, Scotts of Buccleuch, ii, 58. Memorials of the Montgomeries, ii, 64-5.

225. ADC, ii, 185, 230.

226. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iii, 104. The barony of Newburgh, belonging to Henry, lord Sinclair, had fallen under the process of recognition and on 3 March 1508-9, lord Sinclair received a charter of new infeftment. Had lord Erskine's lands been proved to have fallen within the above barony, he would have been compelled to compound for a new infeftment. RMS, ii, 3319.

general application, was more troublesome than his father's averice, for the injury extended to many and most honerable men ... who were forced either to redeem their lands from the collectors of the Exchequer, or surrender part of them'.[227] Craig, in 'jus feudale', maintained that the public found recognition an 'odious impost'.[228] The role of Elphinstone in the exaction of the casualty of recognition is uncertain, but it is likely that he advised James IV as to the financial possibilities of the efficient exploitation of such a process. Elphinstone, as keeper of the privy seal and a regular auditor of the Exchequer, was admirably placed not only to advise James IV on the financial potential of the resurrection of recognition and other feudal incidents, but he was also in a position to understand the fiscal difficulties of the crown in the light of an augmentation in royal expenditure.[229] Similarly the ministers of both Louis XI in France and of Edward IV in England were perfectly aware of the increasing tendancy of crown vassels to evade their legal responsibilities and the former were equally anxious to block these evasions and to ensure that the crown obtained what was legally its due. Buchanan regarded these actions as attempts at increasing the absolutist tendency of the crown, which being odious to him, he criticised. Recognition was not, however, 'long dormant' but had a long, and continuous tradition. In 1405, the lands of Cavers and the office of sheriff of Roxburgh were resumed by Robert III through the process of recognition since the countess of Mar 'had alienated and given sasine thereof to Archibald of Douglas without the king's leave asked and obtained', and the king subsequently granted the lands and office to sir David Flemming of Biggar.[230] On 8 February 1466-7

---

227. Buchanan, History of Scotland, ed. Aikman, 241-2.

228. Craig, Jus Feudale, iii, 3 (32).

229. RSS, i, v. ER, xi, 163, 172, 283, xii, 1, 658, 684, xiii, 358, 401, 616, 624.

230. Hist. MSS. Comm., Appendix to 7th Report, 727.

Colin, earl of Argyll was forced to seek royal confirmation of the concession of the lands of Pannel in Perthshire which had fallen into royal possession as escheat since the later John, lord Lorne had alienated the property without royal consent.[231] Hostility to the exaction of recognition is understandable, but it was not against an innovation, but more probably against the efficient exploitation of the device by James IV. Before the reign of James IV, the appearance of the casualty of recognition must have been extremely rare.

A vassal whose lands were forfeited through the process of recognition could purchase their redemption on the payment of a composition to the treasurer. Although the composition would have been related to the value of the land, many landholders submitted large sums to regain possession of their estates. In 1507, Alan Cathcart of Carlton paid the treasurer £1,246-13-4 of a total composition of £1,333-6-8 for a new infeftment of his lands of Carlton following their recognition, and four years later, the earl of Crawford paid 1,000 marks for a similar charter of the barony of Glenesk.[232] In 1500 Alexander, lord Hume, submitted a composition of £1,333-6-8 to the treasurer for a new infeftment of the lands of Thornton in 1494, recognised to the crown through the alienation of the entire tenandry by John Montgomery, the previous superior.[233] This example revealed that actual payment of the composition might be considerably delayed and that the present owner was not immune to the illegal actions of the previous owner. However, £707-13-9 of the entire composition was remitted by the crown in 1502.[234]

---

231. RMS, ii, 903.

232. TA, iii, 21, iv, 165.

233. RMS, ii, 2211. TA, ii, 11. John Montgomery held the lands of Thornton from a charter of Murdoch, duke of Albany. RMS, ii, 102.

234. TA, ii, 188.

The evidence suggests that the latter half of the reign of James IV witnessed a substantial increase in the employment of recognition as a means of augmenting the royal income. In the account 1507-8, from a total of £3,495 charged to the treasurer for the granting of charters, £2,053 was definitely derived from charters of new infeftment resulting from the incidence of recognition.[235] Charters recorded in the Register of the Great Seal also revealed a similar dramatic increase, for, between 1497 and 1504, only four such charters of new infeftment existed, but for the single year of 1511, the Register accounted for a total of thirty one recognition charters.[236] As in the case of the casualty of non-entry, the process of recognition affected not only the tenant-in-chief, but also the latter's own vassals. As with the exaction of non-entry, most of the new infeftments resulting from recognition recorded in the treasurers' accounts dealt with the superior. However, in the charter of new infeftment granted to Alan Cathcart on 3 December 1505 recorded that the estate involved was composed of 18 marks old extent 'in property' that is land directly exploited by Cathcart and for which he personally would have submitted the appropriate part of the composition, and 35 marks of tenancy, for which the listed free tenants would have produced part of the total composition according to the size of their individual holdings.[237] Most charters of new infeftment included the additional clause that the grantee was given licence to infeft his sub-tenants. On the 26 February 1506-7, Alexander, earl of Huntly, received a regrant of the lands of two Cullerleis, united to the barony of Huntly, with a royal licence to infeft sir Alexander Irvine of Drum as tenant of the earl.[238] These vassals were bound to assist their superior in the

---

235. TA, iv, 3-7.

236. RMS, ii, 2359-2786, 3532-3672.

237. RMS, ii, 2899.

238. RMS, ii, 3071. TA, iii, 233. Composition levied at 100 marks.

payment of his composition. On 14 June 1510 the lords of the Council freed sir Oliver Sinclair of his obligation to infeft John, lord Flemming and sir Alexander Seaton, as they had failed to submit their part of the composition for the barony of Herbertshire.[239]

On occasions, the crown waived its right to pursue the process of recognition. On 14 February 1506-7, James IV renounced all claims to the forfeiture of the lands of Fogo, East Gordon, Lilrig and Rimmiltonlaw, which had been alienated without royal consent by the late Alexander, earl of Huntly.[240] In order to obviate the process of recognition, it was possible to seek a royal letter of licence, permitting the grantee to alienate all or part of his estate. On 22 March 1516-7, such a letter under the privy seal was granted to John Allardice of that ilk, allowing him to sell, alienate or wadset his lands within the barony of Allardice, and the King renounced all right and claim to the lands through forfeiture of escheat.[241]

With this upsurge of interest in the financial possibilities of the efficient exploitation of the casualty of recognition, many landholders were forced to take steps to lessen its effect. On 24 January 1506-7, an indenture between Alexander, earl of Huntly, and Alexander, lord Hume, stated that should the king conduct a process of forfeiture on the barony of Gordon on account of the alienation of part of it by the earl of Huntly to lord Hume, the latter was to deliver an authentic copy of the confirmation which he had or will have obtained of the grant and concerning the lands held by lord Hume from the earl in wadset, lord Hume, with the earl's aid, was also to obtain a confirmation of these lands to save them from forfeiture, but if they were in fact forfeited, then lord Hume would assist the earl to regain them in

---

239. ADC, xxi, f 194. TA, iv, 151. RMS, ii, 3444.

240. RMS, ii, 3057.

241. SRO, Barcley-Allardice Papers, GD 49/23. RSS, i, 1247.

order that the earl could regrant them to lord Hume.[242] However charters of new infeftment involving large portions of land proved to be extremely costly. In the treasurer's account of October 1512 a receipt of £1,500 was received from Matthew, earl of Lennox, for the new infeftment of half of the tenancies of the earldom.[243] Although no specific reasons are given for the new infeftment of the entire earldom of Lennox the instrument of sasine in favour of earl Matthew and his wife, Elizabeth Hamilton, revealed that, in one complete swoop, the fate of the earldom was conclusively settled, with the rights of succession fixed and any crown claims through recognition, non-entry, escheat or resignation perpetually renounced.[244]

The effect of the revival of the casualty of recognition on landowners during the reign of James IV is difficult to assess. Some, like James Ogilvy of Inchmartin in 1513 were able to submit the full composition at the outset,[245] but those faced with larger payments were compelled to render instalments according to the availability of ready cash. In 1508 John, lord Somerville, for a charter of new infeftment of the barony of Carnwath submitted an initial payment of £611 for a composition of £1,333-6-8, and, by 1512, £100 still remained unpaid.[246] However, as far as the crown was concerned, the profits from recognition helped to swell the treasurers' receipts through a dramatic increase in the issuing of royal charters. The average annual receipt to the treasurer from crown charters demonstrated

---

242. Hist, MSS. Comm., Appendix to 12th Report, Earl of Hume, 91. RMS, ii, 3038. Grant recorded in Great Seal Register on 28th January. James IV confirmed the grant of the lands of the demesne of East Gordon, half of the lands of Fogo and lands of Huntlywood to lord Hume by the Earl of Huntly. These lands also referred to the Charter 3057 as part of the four alienations of the earl of Huntly renounced by James IV.

243. TA, iv, 365.

244. Fraser, The Lennox Book, ii, 200-4. The particular confirmation mentioned in the treasurer's account was recorded in the Register of the Great Seal on 8 March 1511-2. RMS, ii, 3712.

245. TA, iv, 386. SRO, Inventory of Leven and Melville Muniments, GD 26/1026-7.

246. TA, iv, 6, 146.

this trend; between 1494 and 1498 it amounted to £923, between 1502 and 1507 to £4,561, and finally between 1511 and 1513 to £3,675.[247] However, it must be said that compositions under the heading of charters in the treasurers' charge were not confined purely to administrative charges. In 1507 Alexander, lord Hume, submitted £235-6-8 as part payment of £950 for all compositions concerned with his lands, reliefs and also accounting arrears.[248] It was common for a variety of debts and payments to be combined under one composition.

In general, the revenue derived from the profits of justice, feudal casualties and the granting of royal charters rose during the course of the reign of James IV. In the early years of the reign, the treasurers' receipts from these sources were of only modest proportions; between 1484 and 1498 a total of £14,156 was accepted into the accounts, but during the first decade of the sixteenth century, the level rose rapidly. Between 1502 and 1508 receipts totalled £76,962 (at an annual average of £12,827), while during the year 1511-12 a total of £19,765 was derived from these sources.[249] It is significant that James IV introduced no new sources of income, but merely tapped the existing ones with greater efficiency and determination. However, part of the increase in the financial return could be traced back to the shift in the system of accounting. The employment of the composition, payable directly to the treasurer, and the subsequent removal of the sheriff from the collection of feudal casualties and issues of justice were significant factors. In order to be able to exploit fully the potential revenue offerred by these sources efficient, experienced and

---

247. See Appendix No.B/9(a)

	Totals
1494-8	£3,692
1502-7	£2,804
1511-3	£3,675

248. TA, iii, 237.

249. See Appendix No. B/9(a)

trustworthy civil servants were required not only to seek out this type of royal revenue at its source but also to ensure that full payment was forthcoming. In England under Edward VI, Commissions of inquiry were established to investigate evasions of royal rights. In Scotland there must have existed a body of faceless men who were employed by the crown to exploit the rights due to the crown. One of the leading officials in this sphere was undoubtedly William Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen. Many such rights were pursued by the crown, through its official representatives, in the courts. For instance, on 22 February 1502-3 the lords of the Council decreed for the king against John, lord Somerville and others concerning the non-entry of the lands of Gilmerton for the previous sixty years and subsequently a composition of £743-6-8 was charged to the treasurer.[250] At the same time a struggle ensued between the crown and George, lord Seaton over recognition of the lands of Winchburgh, in which the latter claimed that the lands under recognition should be 'lattin to burgh' and alleging that although his predecessors had alienated the land, the error did not extend to him as heir and that there were sufficient confirmations, whereas the crown, represented by master James Henrieson, the royal advocate, asserted that the lands should not be 'lattin to burgh'. The result was that lord Seaton was required to submit a composition of 1,000 marks to the treasurer.[251] In addition, efforts were made, on the part of the crown, to ensure that full payment of what was due to the crown was in fact forthcoming. On 27 March 1503 David Beaton brought judicial proceedings against Robert, lord Crichton of Sanquhar, William, lord Carlyle and Andrew, lord Heris for compositions totalling £174-6-8 settled at the last justice ayre

---

250. ADC, xiii, f 60. RMS, ii, 2710, 2712, 2714. RSS, i, 806. This letter to sir John Somerville of Cambusnethan represented a promise of new infeftment in half the lands of Gilmerton in anticipation of the operation of the casualties of non-entry or recognition. TA, ii, 175, 190.

251. ADC, xiii, f 65, 80, 97. TA, ii, 179.

at Dumfries with the threat of doubling the amount should the payment be delayed further.[252] At the same time John, lord Oliphant, the 'pretended possessor' of the lands of Inverpefferny was summoned to court 'becaus his grace was sikkilly informit that viii merkis of annuale was awand til his predecessouris and till him as erlis of Stratherne yeirly of lxxx yeris bipast aucht furth of the sadis landis of Innerpefferny and Dunffanis' and that no payment had been forthcoming for those years. The defender was given to the 1 April to produce charters and instruments of sasine.[253] By December 1503 the lands were adjudged by lords of the Council to have belonged to the crown since Malise, earl of Strathearn had alienated them to Malcolm Utirardour, a clerk, for an annual rent of 8 marks which had not been paid for 184 years, thus accumulating a debt of 1,502 marks.[254] The lands in question had been alienated by Laurence, lord Oliphant to Andrew Wood of Fettercairn and John, lord Drummond, the latter submitting a composition of £666-13-4 in order to recover his rights to the holding.[255] On 22 November 1503 sir John Hay, the son of Hay of Yestir, and John Cunningham of the West Barns were summoned before the lords of the Council for the withholding of the farms of the barony of Snaid, calculated at £100 annually, for eight years following 1482 when the lands were in ward and for the next ten years by reason of non-entry. Sir John produced his testament of sasine and other evidence to prove his legal occupation of the estates but

---

252. ADC, xiv, f 82.

253. ADC, xiv, f 98.

254. RMS, ii, 2762, 2764. Sir Andrew Wood's holding had been alienated from the original estate prior to 1503.

255. TA, ii, 179. In the February 1504-5 account of sir David Beaton of Creich, the treasurer was charged with 500 marks as composition of new infeftment from lord Drummond, but in 1506, a further 500 marks from Drummond for the same charter was charged among the various receipts of Beaton for which he had rendered no previous account and was now charged with them. Either the first submission was only a part payment of the entire composition, of which there was no indication, or else there has been a duplication. TA, iii, 32.

Henrieson, the king's advocate, protested that he had not produced the principal charter or precept of sasine. The decision favoured the crown by stating that John had not revealed sufficient evidence of infeftment and 1 December was assigned for proof of the value of the lands and the length of sir John's occupation.[256] In the account of treasurer, David Beaton of Creich, ending February 1504-5, the non-entry of the barony of Snaid was sold to sir John Hay for a composition of £1,000.[257] These, and various similar cases, revealed the determination on the part of the crown not to allow its financial rights to be frittered away through ignorance of their existance and lack of drive in their pursuit. During the reign of James IV there was a wholehearted effort by the crown to exploit the king's feudal rights which had remained largely in abeyance in previous reigns.

As well as these regular sources of income, the treasurer was also responsible for the receipt of other, more irregular, items of revenue. Although a great majority of feudal casualties which fell to the crown during the reign of James IV were sold for a composition payable to the treasurer, the latter also became responsible for the annual farms of certain lands which were temporarily in the king's hands through ward, non-entry, escheat or which had been apprized for debt. Larger estates were accounted for by specially appointed chamberlains who accounted in the rolls of the Ballivi ad Extra and were under the control of the comptroller.[258] In the reign of James III, the treasurer was recorded as retaining the power to lease lands subject to feudal incidents[259] but after

---

256. ADC, xv, f 55.

257. TA, iv, 182. John Cunningham held a portion of the barony in mortgage. RMS, ii, 2872.

258. ER, xii, 423, 430, 431, 433, 483.

259. ADA, 60.

1501 there was a substantial increase in leasing on the part of the treasurer. Between 1502 and 1507, returns from leasing lands temporarily in the crown's hands reached an annual average of £856 which subsequently declined to £714 in 1507-8 and £499 in 1511-2.[260] In 1502, the treasurer was charged with the farms of the lands of Garlies which were in ward and which had been let to John Dunbar of Mochrum for £146-13-4 annually.[261] In the following account of 1502-5 there was a spate of similar entries, the lands of Gleneagles,in ward, were leased to Richard Lawson and John Elphinstone for £186-13-4 annually and the lands of Plumton, in the king's hands through the escheat of the laird, were let to the lairds of Cally and Gaitgirth for an annual farm of 40 marks. In addition certain estates were in the hands of the crown for other reasons; the lands of Trochane since the owner, George Gordon, was at the king's horn, the lands of Terrauchty since they had been apprized to the crown for debt while a relief of £40 from the lands of Mochnes and Gofurd was charged directly to the treasurer.[262] The majority of lands entered in this section of the treasurer's charge made only swift appearance, yet the lands of the constabulary of Dundee, in ward and leased to Master John Scrimgeour at £173-6-4 annually, were first charged to the treasurer for the Whitsun term of 1504, and continued to be entered until 1512. However, for the year 1512-3, the farm was not received into the treasurer's account since 100 marks of the annual rent had been assigned to the constable and his wife for their maintenance during the ward and a further £50 was gifted to Richard Graham, the king's servant.[263] In 1492, sir William Douglas, the second son of Archibald, earl of Angus,

260. See Appendix No. B/9(a)

261. TA, ii, 18.

262. TA, ii, 193-5.

263. TA, ii, 193, iv, 170, 390.

received a grant of the ward of the lands of the late sir John Auchinlek and also the marriage of Elizabeth, heiress to the estates.[264] It would seem that, in effect, the earl of Angus received the benefits of the casualty, for in 1501, sir William Douglas complained that his father, then in ward in Dumbarton castle, had refused to deliver the writs of the lands of Glenbervie, Barras and Kemnay to him and had returned a wrong valuation of the lands 'through the wilful mistakes of the inquest'.[265] Sir William Douglas declared himself 'young and unacquainted with the law' and the crown seems to have taken advantage of the situation for, in the treasurer's account of 1502-5, the farms of the lands of Auchinlek, Glenbervie, Barras and Kemnay were received by the treasurer from the lessee, John, prior of St. Andrews.[266] Although the lands of Auchinlek were granted to Thomas Boswell in 1504,[267] the lands of Glenbervie, Barras and Kemnay, stated to be in the hands of the king 'be errour', continued to be leased to the prior of St. Andrews for a cash and kind farm submitted annually to the treasurer.[268] Such entries tended to cease if the casualty was subsequently sold or if the lands received charters of new infeftment. Thus, the lands of Glenbervie, Barras and Kemnay were last recorded in the 1512 account since on 9 July 1512, the ward and non-entry of the lands in question was gifted to Archibald, earl of Angus, until the legal entry of the heirs.[269] Similarly, in 1507, the treasurer was in receipt of £60-5-4 for the Martinmas farm of the baronies of Dunmany and Bernbowgale, in ward, but he was to make no

---

264. Fraser, Douglas Book, iii, 136-7.

265. Fraser, Douglas Book, iii, 156. ADC, (Stair Society), 114-5. It would appear that Douglas's right to the profits of the lands through the royal gift were disputed by sir John Auchinlek. ADC, i, 262-3, 265, 268, 292.

266. TA, ii, 13, 193. RSS, i, 646, 804, 805. The lands were revalued by an assise of local landowners in 1501-2. TA, ii, 118, 123, 133.

267. RMS, ii, 2805, 2859. Lands were claimed by William Douglas and his wife Elizabeth Auchinlek, but they suffered under the process of recognition.

268. TA, ii, 13, 193, iii, 28, 242, iv, 10, 170. The wrong valuation at the inquest was probably the excuse for royal resumption of the casualty.

269. RSS, i, 2411.

further receipts as the casualty had been sold before the next term.[270]

The king profited from the vacancy of ecclesiastical sees and abbacies. Until the intimation of bulls of provision, the king retained his option to exercise his right to patronage and presentation, and, in addition, the temporalities of the see, which included the lands, revenues, tithes and casualties, might be retained in royal hands or granted to another ecclesiastic or layman.[271] On 1 May 1507, James IV granted to the executors of the late bishop of Ross the gift of the temporalities of the see for the next year, for which the three executors compounded with the treasurer for the sum of 600 marks.[272] In the 1502 account, a composition of £300 was received from Master John Spens, executor of the late Andrew, bishop of Moray, for amongst other things, the temporalities of Caithness.[273] Before the full development of the office of treasurer, the revenues from the temporalities of vacant bishoprics were received by the chamberlain[274] and later by local Ballivi ad Extra. In 1441, John Fife, the king's receiver within the sheriffdoms of Aberdeen and Banff, was charged with certain revenues from the see of Aberdeen, in 1460 and 1461, the chamberlain of the earldom of Moray was charged with the farms of lands belonging to the vacant see of Moray, and in 1466 and 1467, the receiver of Fife received kind returns from the bishopric of St. Andrews.[275] There can be little doubt that James IV used the wealth of the church to augment his own income. In 1497, he appointed his younger brother, James, duke of Ross, to the vacant see of St. Andrews on the death of William Schevez, thus

---

270. TA, iii, 241-2.

271. APS, ii, 133. ADC, i, 116, 334-5.

272. RSS, i, 1469.

273. ER, v, 94-5, vi, 648-9, vii, 16, 384, 458.

274. ER, iv, 36, 68, 99.

275. TA, ii, 17.

releasing the lands of the earldom of Ross, Brechin and Nevar, and Ardmanach at a gross aggregate farm of £709-7-8 to the crown by August 1502.[276] On the death of the duke of Ross in 1504, the king secured the archbishopric of St. Andrews for the eldest of his illegitimate children, Alexander Stewart, a boy of eleven, who was unable to take legal possession of the bast temporalities of the see which were diverted to the royal treasury. During the period of Alexander Stewart's occupancy of the see, the profits from St. Andrews were delivered into the treasurer's coffers to the tune of £13,480 for the period covered by these accounts.[277] In the account of 1505, the treasurer received a total of £3,791-19s 'in good money' from the coffers of the late Archbishop, which was merely taken over by the crown.[278] Receipts were rendered annually from the lands of the see, both in money rents and also cash resulting from the commutation of kind farms, administrative charges, outstanding debts due to the late bishop and from the abbeys of Holyrood and Dunfermline, over which the Archbishop of St. Andrews acted as commendator.[279] Although such interference in the wealthiest see in Scotland was hardly likely to augment the well-being of the church, it did contribute a large amount of cash to the crown. It was, in theory, common practice for a new prelate to compound with the treasurer for admission to his temporality. In 1491 the treasurer was charged with £200 received from Master John Guthrie, elect of Ross, 'for the anna of the temporalite', and in 1512 the abbot of Jedburgh rendered £300 for his admission.[280]

It was only towards the end of the fifteenth century that responsibility

---

276. ER, xii, 151, 241, 242.

277. TA, ii, 196, iii, 29-30, 243, iv, 11-12, 391. The total was undoubtedly larger for the entire reign, but no accounts have survived for the years 1508-11.

278. TA, iv, 196. Total included £9-6-10 in 'insufficient money'.

279. Mackie, King James IV of Scotland, 159.

280. TA, i, 197, iv, 391.

for the profits of the coinage fell to the treasurer.[281] These entries consisted only of the total receipts and were based on more detailed mint accounts. The treasurer received £20 from sir Thomas Tod "of the cunzee siluir of the pennyis" on 5 February 1496-7 and fifteen days later, he received a further £157-12s from Master John Fraser, clerk of the Register, from a chain, weighing 21¾ ounces 'cunzeit be the kingis command and resauit tharof aucht score xiiii uncornis'.[282] Thereafter, profit from the royal mint formed a regular feature of the treasurer's charge. Between February 1505-6 and August 1508, the treasurers' receipts from this source totalled £6,644.[283] However, the profit for the year 1511-2 stood at £7,621, £5,793 from the mint, £1,089 from the coining of twenty three links of the king's great chain into unicorns, £611 from the minting of certain silver and gilt plate in to placks, and £127-10s from the commuting of a silver container into groats of 12 pence.[284] This figure was far larger than any previous account and demonstrated the fiscal potential of the mint as a part of royal income.[285]

Between 1502 and 1508 fees arising from the operation of the great seal were charged to the treasurer. In 1506, receipts from this source totalled £456-5s, apart from two bonds of £20 from lord Cathcart and £2 from Andrew Brabonar to be charged in the future, and £134 was received from Master James Douglas, and a further £210 from Walter Chapman, for the fee of the signet.[286] However, the normal procedure would seem to have been that the keepers of the great seal and signet, like those of the privy seal,

---

281. In the fifteenth century, receipts from the mint accounts were made by the treasurer, comptroller and king's steward. (ER, v, 119, 128, 132, vii, 292, 369, 429. Also see the accounts of the Moneyer. For further details, see the chapter on the coinage.

282. TA, i, 312-3.

283. See Appendix No. B/9(a)

284. TA, iv, 171-2.

285. For the significance and effect of such entries, see the chapter on the currency.

286. TA, iii, 30.

received their own fees from each grantee whose writ was entered in their respective registers.

In common with other merchants and ship owners, most of the king's ships served a dual role, they were used both for military purposes and also for legitimate trading ventures. In peace time, James IV hired out his armed merchantmen for trading ventures rather than leave the ships idle. In 1496 James Wood, master of the king's ship, 'Douglas', issued a bond to the treasurer for £90, the cost of hiring the 'Douglas' for two voyages 'in and furth' in 1496 and similarly John Irvine, master of the bark 'Cristofer' submitted £100 for the cost of hiring the vessel for the year ending at Whitsun 1497.[287] In 1498 the treasurer received from James Wood and John Irvine, 'for the fraucht of the bark 'Douglas' and 'Cristofer' two 'steiks of Rowane tanne and ane steik of Ristlis blak' respectively, a total value of £67.[288] It was only later in the reign that the building of ships almost purely for military activities was initiated. Although the king was eager to hire out royal ships to private contractors, because of the lack of naval resources, in 1502, James IV was compelled to charter vessels for particular ventures. In May 1502, the 'Egill' was hired from lord Seaton for an expedition to Denmark, and part of the deal seems to have been that Seaton was to have the vessel ready to sail by 8 May and this he failed to do.[289] On 9 September 1502, he was summoned to answer before the lords of the Council and was ordered to replenish the king for the £400 spent by the latter on equipping of the ship, a further £526-16-11 for additional expenses incurred by the king 'in the graithing and furnising of the sade schip of the 'Egill' and, in addition, he was to forfeit the ship.[290] By a later settlement of 17 September, lord Seaton was required

---

287. TA, i, 217.

288. TA, i, 318.

289. TA, ii, 146.

290. ADC, Stair Society, 191.

to pay a total of £952 including the restoration of his ship, and although he submitted £750 to the treasurer in the 1505 account,[291] he was eventually forced to sell the ship to the king for £200.[292] The failure of lord Seaton to fulfil the terms of his contract with the crown in May 1502 proved to be an expensive lapse of which James IV took full advantage.

On 20 November 1495 the treasurer was charged with a total of £850-15s 'of it that was tane fra Jhonne Williamsoune, at the Kingis command, in woll and merchandreis', which was prized by Master Alexander Sinclair, and part of the proceeds delivered to certain merchants for the king's debts.[293] Unfortunately there is no indication of the reasons behind this action.

The treasurer's charge contained other isolated, yet interesting, entries. In the account ending July 1498, compositions were charged from the burghs of Dundee (£225) and Perth (£150) and also from the laird of Gardin in Augus (£20) 'for leif to thaim to remane at hame fra the Raid of Norem'.[294] In 1504 the treasurer, David Beaton of Creich, was charged with £834-3s, the contents of a box remaining with Andrew Ayton after the death of sir Robert Lundy of Balgony, then treasurer, but he was not charged with a further £70, also from the box, since it had been delivered to a certain Frenchman to pay for wine purchased from him.[295] It is possible that Robert Lunday died fairly suddenly and that Ayton was left holding a box containing receipts, the majority of which had not as yet been expended

---

291. TA, ii, lxxxvi, 191. There is no record of any further payment but it seems that his goods were ordered to be distrained for £500 owed by lord Seaton to the king, which may have been the rest of the settlement, since, under the terms of the decree, a double levy was due on the failure of complete payment not being achieved by next Whitsunday. ADC, Stair Society, 192.

292. TA, ii, 422.

293. TA, i, 219-20.

294. TA, i, 313, 316.

295. TA, ii, 196.

and was therefore merely carried forward into the account of the next treasurer.

A further item which appeared in the treasurer's charge, and which will not be discussed at this juncture, was the issues of tax contributions.[296] However, it would seem that the issues of certain tax assessments which were recorded in the treasurer's charge became submerged in the general expenses of the discharge.

There can be little doubt that the treasurer's charge increased enormously during the reign of James IV. Since the irregular duration of many of the treasurers' accounts makes any assessment of the movement of his receipts extremely difficult, it has been necessary to work out an average annual receipt for specific periods covered by these accounts. By this means, it would appear that between 1494 and 1498 the average annual income of the king's treasurer amounted to £5,309, between 1502 and 1507 to £20,512, and for the years 1511-2 and 1512-3 the annual receipt totalled £31,339 and £12,167 respectively.[297] The king's preoccupation with the preparations for the English invasion may in fact have contributed to the small return for the final year to the reign. However, apart from the year 1512-3, the figures revealed a substantial augmentation in the business transacted by the treasurer during the reign of James IV. However, many of the new items which appeared in the treasurers' charge during the latter years of James IV, namely tax contributions, profits from the mint, fees of the great seal and signet and the annual submissions from the archbishop of St. Andrews, tended to reveal the desperation on the part of James IV to tap all available sources of revenue to pay for the rapidly rising expenditure of the treasurer, especially on the household, shipping,

---

296. See The Conclusion.

297. See Appendix No. B/9(a)

public works and military ventures. It was a feature of the reign that the treasury attained its full potential as a fiscal department from 1500, an event which was greatly facilitated by the increasing employment of the composition as a means of cash payment due to the king, aided also by the financial decline of the office of sheriff.

The above figures included all the receipts charged to the treasurers with two notable exceptions. The inclusion of such large windfalls of money, in the figures mentioned above would have served only to distort the overall trend of these accounts. Firstly, in his first account, William, lord St. John accounted for the remains of the hoard of James III which had been found after the battle of Sauchieburn. The total coin recovered amounted to the sum of £24,517-10s, which was included in the 1492 account of lord St. John, and seems to have saved the account from a substantial deficit. On 17 June 1488, the earls of Angus, and Argyll, the bishop of Glasgow, lords Hailes and Hume and the treasurer were, by the king's commend, to proceed to Edinburgh castle 'to see the jowalis, siluer money and vthir stuff' A large quantity of coin, jewels, ornaments and plate was found in coffers and boxes lodged in the castle.[299] It had been left behind by James III on his departure from Edinburgh to face the rebels at Sauchieburn. Of the remainder, some may have been spent in mustering and equipping the king's army, and some was undoubtedly distributed among the supporters of James III. However, a few additional coffers were recovered from the abbot of Arbroath, treasurer under the late king, the countess of Athole and three persons, James Avery, William Paterson and William Wallace, who 'wist of the said box quhen it was in the myre'.[300] In addition, Walter Simpson received a liferent

298. TA, i, 79-80.

299. TA, i, 80-5.

300. TA, i, 85-7.

grant of part of the lands of Cessintully and Coldoch in the earldom of Menteith and a further £5 from the treasurer, for the recovery of a certain box containing £4,000 in gold coin and the sword of Robert Bruce from the battle field at Stirling.[301] Concerning the remainder of the treasure of James III, the Parliament of 6 February 1491-2 stated that the late king possessed 'gret tressor and substance of gold and silver cunzeit and uncunzeit and utheris prisious jowells to grete avale, the quhilk tressour and substance com never to the handis of oure soverane lord that now is bot a small litle parte tharof to litle avale and quantite in regard of the gret tressour that he haid in deposit' and the sheriffs were ordered to inquire into the retention of this fortune.[302] There is no further record of any subsequent recovery of the hoard of James III and it can only be surmised that either large quantities had been stolen or retained by the supporters of James III or else the amount assumed by contemporaries was vastly over-exaggerated. Even the amount recovered formed a considerable fortune in itself, £24,500 in Scots, French and English coin and such costly items as a 'Sanct Michaell of gold with a perle on his spere' and 'a collare of gold with nynetene diamantis'.[303]

Although parts of James III's hoard were discovered in a variety of locations, at the site of the battle, and in the mire, it seems unlikely that James would have transported large quantities of his resources with him. It would seem that, apart from small quantities of cash given to loyal servants of James III, some of which was in fact recovered, it is likely that the bulk of James III's fortune in fact remained in Edinburgh castle,

---

301. TA, i, 97. RMS, ii, 1820. ER, x, 82, 187, 502. The grant was valued at £4-10s annually and continued until 1495.

302. APS, ii, 230.

303. TA, i, 81, 84.

for even by the standards Mediaeval Scotland, the cash and jewelry actually recovered was considerable. It is difficult to imagine James amassing any larger fortune from the financial resources at his commend.

Secondly, the accounts from 1502 until 1506 were artificially inflated by the treasurer's receipt of the king's dowry from England on the occasion of his marriage to Margaret Tudor. By the terms of the marriage negotiations concluded on 24 January 1501-2, James IV was required to endow Margaret with £6,000 Scots from his own patrimony, of which £1,000 was detailed for her own disposal, and the king of England contracted to pay a dowry of 30,000 angel nobles, 10,000 on the marriage day, and the remainder within the next two years.[304] Thus, in the account ending February 1505, the treasurer was charged with £23,333-6-8 Scots for the first two terms of the dowry payment, and in the account ending August 1506, a further instalment of £11,666-13-4 was recorded, making an overall total of £35,000.[305]

304. Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland, iv, 336-7½

305. TA, ii, 196, iii, 33.

THE ACCOUNTS OF THE CHAMBERLAIN

Although the accounts of the chamberlain do not form part of the main body of the study, they are considered for the short period of the Albany regencies in order to reveal the nature of the scope of the principal fiscal officer before the financial alterations initiated by James I. These accounts demonstrated not only the relative simplicity of central financial organisation when compared with arrangements in the later fifteenth century but also, in association with the rolls of the customers and burgh baillies, the extent of the alienation of royal revenues.

It is probable that the office of chamberlain was one of the administrative innovations originating from the reign of David I. Although the evidence is obscure, it would appear that David, when earl of Huntingdon and ruler of Clydesdale and Teviotdale, employed an officer called 'camerarius'.[1] Subsequent to that reference, the editor of the second volume of the 'Exchequer Rolls' has provided a fairly comprehensive list of the holders of that office.[2] During the period from the reign of David I to the return of James I from captivity in England, the chamberlain was established as the principal fiscal officer of the crown. The office stood at the apex of royal financial arrangements, handling receipts from various local receivers (Ballivi ad Extra, customers and burgh baillies), feudal casualties, escheats, payments due from thanages, fines from shrieval and justiciary courts, and compositions from royal letters, of gift remission and legitimization, and being responsible for the cost of the upkeep of the royal household, military expenses not covered by feudal obligation, and various other miscellaneous costs. In addition, the chamberlain exercised considerable jurisdiction over the royal burghs and

---

1. ER, ii, cxvii-cxvii.

2. ER, ii, cxviii-cxxv. Handbook of British Chronology, 177-180.

he was bound to hold an annual ayre in the burghs to deal with cases in contravention of the burgh's privileges and the various restrictive trading regulations. Sole control over the king's finances ensured that the chamberlain remained one of the principal officers in the king's administration.

During the fourteenth century, the office of chamberlain was held either by churchmen, namely William Bullock, John of Roxburgh, and Walter of Biggar, or magnates like Thomas, earl of Angus and Thomas, earl of Mar. However, after the death of sir John Lyon of Glamis in 1382, Robert II granted the office of chamberlain to his second son, Robert, earl of Fife and Menteith.[3] Already a considerable landowner and a powerful voice in Scottish affairs, the granting of the principal financial office of the crown to the earlof Fife consolidated his position as the most powerful magnate in Scotland. Control over the king's finances was an invaluable asset in the search for political power. The earl of Fife, created duke of Albany in 1398, retained the office of chamberlain for twenty six years. On the death of Robert III, the duke of Albany combined the offices of governor and chamberlain for the year ending March 1406-7, but on the 12 March of that year, he conferred the office on the eldest son of his second marriage, John, earl of Buchan,[4] an appointment which he retained until his death in 1424. Although ostensibly the earl of Buchan retained the office of chamberlain throughout the entire captivity of James I, there can be little doubt that the influence of Albany was never far away. The chamberlain's accounts for the period 1406-7 to 1422 revealed that the office was not, in fact, under the independent control of the earl of Buchan. The audit of 1408 recorded that within the account of the

---

3. ER, iii, 657.

4. ER, iv, 35, 65. RMS, i, 889.

chamberlain, the duke of Albany retained a separate account, rendered by his secretary, Andrew Hawick, with a charge and discharge completely separate from that of Buchan. In addition Albany's share of the receipts from the customers, burgh baillies, sheriffs, feudal casualties and vacant sees, at £1,961-14-6, was significantly larger than the combined totals of the chamberlain and his deputy at £327-2-9.[5]

In subsequent years, the receipts seem to have been under the nominal responsibility of the earl of Buchan, but in the audits of 1409, 1410, 1413, 1421, and 1422, the accounts appear to have been divided between income received by the chamberlain on his own behalf, and also income received by him on Albany's behalf.[6] On each of these occasions, the receipts on the governor's behalf formed by far the larger portion. In the local customer and burgh baillie accounts large payments were annually reserved for the duke of Albany with a marginal indication that the chamberlain was to account for them.[7] From the evidence available, it would appear that the duke of Albany retained the lion's share of revenue bound for the chamberlain for his own personal use, a situation which was sometimes reflected in the actual chamberlains' accounts. This odd fiscal arrangement was undoubtedly occasioned by Albany's desire to ensure that his personal claims on the chamberlain's receipts were given preference over all other demands. Frequently the inability of the chamberlain's income to meet the full demands made upon it rendered such an expedient necessary. In 1422, the total charge recorded in the account of the earl of Buchan

---

5. ER, iv, 64-71.

6. ER, iv, 98-103, 128-133, 186-190, 353-7, 373-8.

7. ER, iv, 137 et seq. Before the 1412 account payments from the accounts of the customers and burgh baillies were made to the chamberlain and the duke of Albany separately with the marginal reference, 'computandum est cum duce'.

amounted to only £1,243-8s, from which the duke of Albany's fees and pensions, totalling £1,469-6-8, were met in full.[8] From such a situation, it is not surprising that the chamberlain's accounts ran into heavy debt, over which the earl of Buchan seems to have had little avenue of escape as long as he was burdened by the demands of his father.

The power and importance of the office of chamberlain can be easily assessed by the fact that it attracted a fee of £200 annually during the tenure of the house of Albany.[9] In 1407 the duke of Albany received the fee as chamberlain in his own right, but from 1408 until 1414 he continued to receive it although his son had been appointed to the office.[10]

There can be little doubt that neither the duke of Albany nor the earl of Buchan performed the onerous and tedious duties of their office personally, especially since the latter was frequently engaged in military expeditions in France during his tenure in office.[11]

In 1389, the duke of Albany received the assistance of two deputies, Patrick Lumley responsible for the land south of the Forth, and sir Walter Tulloch for the region to the north of the Forth.[12] By the death of Robert III, sir John Forrester and David, earl of Crawford held these offices respectively, but with the latter's death sometime before March 1406-7, the two offices of deputy chamberlain were united under sir John Forrester until 1424.[13] There can be little doubt that the bulk of the everyday work of the office was supervised by the deputy chamberlain, who

---

8. ER, iv, 374-8.

9. ER, iv, 39, 67, 101, 133, 160, 189, 212, 238, 265, 288, 309, 336, 356. APS, i, 346.

10. ER, iv, 67, 101, 133, 189, 212.

11. Balfour-Melville, James I, King of Scots, 79, 85-6, 115.

12. ER, iii, 236-245.

13. ER, iv, 35, 37, 64.

in turn employed servants to perform the more menial tasks.[14] For example in 1421 the account of John, earl of Buchan as chamberlain was in fact rendered at Perth by sir John Forrester, his deputy.[15] Smaller men were engaged in the physical collection of the revenue, men like William Cadzow, clerk of the chancery, who frequently received cash bound for the chamberlain.[16] It would seem that cash bound for the coffers of the duke of Albany was handled by his secretary, Andrew Hawick and later Nicholas Hunter, who witnessed and also received payments,[17] and also acted as auditors.[18]

During the period of Albany's regency (1406 to 1424), accounts were rendered annually by the chamberlain and his deputy. The bulk of the business was transacted in the chamberlain's account as that of the deputy received only a small proportion of royal revenue from the localities. Between 1412 and 1418, out of total receipts of £11,505 from local receivers, the accounts of the deputy chamberlain handled only £287.[19] Therewas a close connection between the accounts of the chamberlain and his deputy and the latter made annual payments from his receipts to both the chamberlain and the duke of Albany.[20] Frequently, the deputy's account seems to have been deliberately overexpended through such payments being in excess of the charge. In the 1417 account of sir John Forrester of Corstorphine

---

14. ER, iv, 66, 160. In fact, despite submitting an account on his own behalf, the deputy chamberlain was probably responsible for the entire fiscal scope of the absentee chamberlain.

15. ER, iv, 353.

16. ER, iv, 109, 175, 177, 181, 200, 205, 207.

17. ER, iv, 5, 38, 43, 51, 144, 146, 310, 311, 315, 317.

18. ER, iv, 72, 104, 166, 284, 310, 332.

19. ER, iv, 185-309.

20. See Appendix No.B/7(b)

as deputy chamberlain the total charge amounted to £19-0-6 and Forrester delivered £20 to Albany and £36-13-4 to the chamberlain, thus augmenting the adverse balance of the account.[21] However, for ease of calculation, the receipts of the chamberlain and his deputy have added together to form overall totals of the various sources of income.[22]

The main body of the chamberlain's receipts were derived from the sheriffs, the customers, the burgh baillies and the chamberlain ayres. Since the sheriff received a large portion of his income from feudal casualties and the profits of justice, which fluctuated greatly in amount, the chamberlain's revenue from this source also varied considerably. In 1418 the chamberlain received payments from only two sheriffs, £20 from the sheriff of Ayr and £6 from the sheriff of Kincardine, whereas in 1421, receipts totalled £1,225-8-3.[23] Such large totals were frequently the result of sudden windfalls of cash received by one or two individual sheriffs, for, in 1421, the sheriff of Fife contributed £779-6-8 and the sheriff of Forfar £339-1-4 to the chamberlain's charge.[24] Occasionally the sheriff seems to have compounded with the chamberlain for a sum smaller than was due. In 1415, the sheriff of Kincardine submitted £20-14s to the chamberlain as one term's rent of the lands of the barony of Colly in the hands of the crown either through ward or non entry, and a further £32 for the relief of the barony through a composition made with the governor.[25] However, since the majority of entries concerning the

---

21. ER, iv, 284-5.

22. See Appendix No.B/7(a)

23. ER, iv, 307, 356.

24. ER, iv, 356.

25. ER, iv. 235. A relief was usually calculated at one year's rent which, in the case of the barony of Colly would have amounted to around £40.

chamberlain's receipts from the sheriffs only provided the total contribution, it is impossible to gain any insight into the composition of these receipts.

The customers provided the basis of the chamberlain's charge. The receipts were both large and consistent. Between 1409 and 1416, the average annual yield from the customers to the chamberlain amounted to £2,237 but during the final years of the regency the average receipts fell dramatically to only £1,029 annually.[26] In comparison, the receipts from the burgh baillies were relatively insignificant. During the entire regency, the contribution from the royal burghs remained at a steady level, averaging between £10 and £30 annually.

Since the annual payment from individual burghs to the chamberlain tended to be fixed by the conservative nature of the baillies' accounts, variations in the chamberlain's income from this source was normally the result of inherent irregularity in accounting on the part of the baillies.[27] In addition, the chamberlain accounted for receipts from the issues of the chamberlain ayres. The chamberlain ayre represented a circuit court under the direction of the chamberlain which made regular visitations to the various royal burghs in order to dispense justice and supervise burghal affairs. Since the chamberlain ayres were in theory conducted annually in the royal burghs under the supervision of the chamberlain[28] it was natural that the profits should be encompassed within the chamberlain's accounts. In common with the returns from the burgh baillies, the total

---

26. See Appendix No.B/7(a)
The latter total was calculated for the year 1417-22. For details of this decline, see the chapter on the customs.

27. See Appendix No.B/7(a)
The burgh farms, by the early fifteenth century, tended to be a fixed levy through either lease or feu, and almost all the pensions were also fixed and regular, with the result, the remaining cash, normally paid over to the chamberlain, also tended to be fixed.

28. ER, iv, 288.

issues from the chamberlain ayres varied according to the number of individual returns, for, in 1418, the chamberlain's accounts recorded receipts from only two ayres, totalling £7-13-4, whereas in 1422, returns of £75 were recorded from fourteen ayres[29]. It would seem that many of the burghs must have entered into some agreement with the chamberlain whereby a regular token payment was rendered on behalf of the ayre issues. During the regency, Dundee (10 marks), Perth (10 marks), Peebles (5 marks), and Montrose (£2) made static annual returns from the chamberlain ayre held within these burghs and the receipts from most of the other burghs tended to fluctuate only fractionally.[30] There were occasions when the issues from the chamberlain ayres were diverted to other uses, from 1409 to 1413 the chamberlain ayre receipts from the burgh of Edinburgh were gifted by the governor for the building of the Church of St. Giles in the burgh while,[31] in 1415, it was stated that the issues from the Stirling ayre had been granted to assist the building of a bridge at Stirling.[32] In 1421 the ayre receipts from Perth were remitted by the governor[33] and, a year later, the returns from Aberdeen, Ayr, Dumbarton, Rutherglen and Stirling were respited by the duke of Albany.[34] Frequent intrusions into the receipts from the chamberlain ayres and irregularity in their occurrence greatly reduced the full potential of this source of revenue.[35]

---

29. ER, iv, 306, 375.

30. ER, iv, 35-378.

31. ER, iv, 129, 162, 188.

32. ER, iv, 236.

33. ER, iv, 354.

34. ER, iv, 375.

35. ER, iv, 210, (There was an ayre held at Montrose in 1414 but expenses consumed the entire returns), 334, (Ayres were held but there was no agreement concerning the extent of the issues as the chamberlain was abroad), 374, (Ayres held but no issues raised).

Other items entered in the chamberlain's charge tended to be of a haphazard nature. During the regency there were two instances of revenue being derived from vacant bishoprics. In the 1406-7 and 1407-8 accounts of the chamberlain, £53-6-8 was received annually from the farms and returns of the temporalities of the bishopric of Brechin and in the former account, the temporalities were stated to have been leased by the governor to the earl of Crawford.[36] In addition, during the latter account, the bishopric of Moray also fell vacant, but the farms were gifted by the governor partly to the earl of Moray and partly for the rebuilding of Elgin Cathedral, although the value of the concession was reduced by the fact that the lands of the bishopric were in waste at that time.[37] In 1409, the sheriffs of Peebles and Lanark submitted a total of £232-11-8 from the farms of the lands of the vacant bishopric of Glasgow within their respective sheriffdoms for the terms of Whitsun and half of Martinmas. The remainder of the returns of the latter term was granted to the bishop 'by the grace' of the governor and a further £19-6-8 was reserved for the fees of baillies and sergeants within the see and for remissions granted by the governor to relatives of the late bishop of Glasgow.[38] Further, in 1407-8 the chamberlain was responsible for the collection of certain casualties, the relief of the lands of sir Alexander Lawder in the sheriffdom of Edinburgh (20 marks), of all the lands of William Erskine (40 marks) and all the lands of William Hay, the constable (200 marks) as well as one term's ward of the lands of the earl of Crawford (£66-13-4).[39] In 1417, £133-6-8 was charged to the

---

36. ER, iv, 36, 68. Stephen de Cellario died 11 November 1404 and Walter Forrester was constituted 13 May 1410.

37. ER, iv, 69. William de Spynie died 2 August 1406 and John Innes was constituted on 23 January 1406-7.

38. ER, iv, 99. Matthew Glendouwyn died 10 May 1408 and William Lawder was constituted in July 1408.

39. ER, iv. 68.

chamberlain from the sale of certain feudal casualties.[40] Since feudal casualties were normally collected by the local sheriff these entries probably represented early examples of the sale of feudal incidents for an agreed composition to the chamberlain, an expedient fully exploited under James IV and V.

During the course of rule of the two Albanys, the income flowing into the chamberlain's coffers suffered a steady decline. From 1407-8 to 1413 the average annual revenue which appeared in the chamberlain's charge amounted to £2,572, between 1413 and 1417, it fell to £1,996 annually, and for the final years of 1417 to 1422, the average yield stood at only £1,456 annually. The principal cause of this decline was a marked fall in the revenue derived from the various local accountants, especially the customers. Fraud, ignorance, the wanton granting of large hereditary pensions, and an increasing tendency to avoid the payment of customs all took their toll.[41] Also, within the chamberlain's own account there was a tendency to engage in the concession of annuities and to suffer through the alienation of revenue.

A large portion of the chamberlain's charge was swallowed up by excessive largesse in the shape of large pensions and fees, both to influencial men and to the duke of Albany himself. The scale of such demands on the chamberlain's income ensured that the accounts were forced to ensure a mounting debt. For instance, the total income received by the chamberlain in 1415-6 amounted to £2,541 from which the demands of annual pensions and fees immediately removed £1,809.[42] The gravity of the situation is more obvious when it is realised that the receipts for that particular year were unusually high, as the figures in the above

---

40. ER, iv, 286.

41. For details, see the chapter on the custom's accounts.

42. See Appendix No.B/7(c)
ER, iv, 261-6.

paragraph have explained. However, such a situation must be assessed in the light of the unsatisfactory position which had arisen after the death of Robert III and the capture of his only son, James.

It is easy to be censorious over Robert, duke of Albany, as Balfour-Melville has been, for, when summing up his character, he described Albany as 'an easy-going ruler, anxious for popularity' and maintaining that his term of office 'was most injurious to Scotland, where a strong hand was required to bring the nobles under control'.[43] This assessment seems to ignore the complexity of the situation into which the duke of Albany was placed in 1406. Two overriding factors greatly affected the position, firstly, that the greater magnates of Scotland had been unused to a 'strong hand' since the days of Robert I, and secondly, although his 'governorship was equivalent to kingship de facto',[44] the fact that Albany was not king 'de jure' greatly enhanced his difficulties in controlling the mightier magnates since he lacked the full backing of the law.[45] Thus, Albany's policy of attracting their loyalty, or at worst, their tolerance, by means of timely concessions and the ability to overlook the worst purprestures, was perhaps the only alternative available. However, almost all the pensions and fees which appeared in the chamberlain's accounts during the regency were originally derived from the reigns of Robert II and III and Albany was in no position to tamper with them. Annuities to scions of the royal house, sir John Stewart of Railston,[46] and sir Thomas Stewart of Kelly,[47] and also to William Foullerton[48] were hereditary grants and

---

43. Balfour-Melville, James I, King of Scots, 83.

44. Ibid, 83.

45. For instance, Albancy was unable to employ the weapon or even the threat of forfeiture.

46. ER, iii, 585, 609, 644, 692, 700.

47. ER, iii, 31, 585, 609, 644, 653, 661, 675, 693.

48. ER, iii, 242, 275, 316, 348, 667, 682, 692.

were automatically paid. The largest pension of 200 marks was paid to Alexander Stewart, earl of Mar through the right of his wife, Isabelle, heiress to the Mar estates.[49] Originally paid to the earl of Douglas, from the customs of Haddington, the pension became part of the grant made to Alexander Stewart after he had murdered sir Malcolm Drummond and forcibly married his widow, the countess of Mar.[50]

Many of these pensions and fees were derived from the customs or burgh farms of a particular burgh but the cash involved was allowed through the accounts of the chamberlain, who was subsequently responsible for the payment. For instance, sir John Stewart of Railston was allowed £20 from the customs of Perth, but, instead of being paid directly from the customs accounts, payment was made through the chamberlain.[51] In this particular case, after the financial powers of the chamberlain had been curbed in 1424, the annuity became the direct responsibility of the customers of Perth.[52] Although by the terms of the grant, the pension of 200 marks to the earl of Mar was payable from the customs of Haddington, the fall in the customs returns of that burgh made full payment impossible and it became a permanent feature of the chamberlain's discharge.[53] With the abolition of most of the chamberlain's financial powers in 1424, these pensions were either revoked or became payable from local sources.

Shortage of available cash on the part of the chamberlain meant that certain annuities were not paid in full. The earl of Mar was due to receive a total of £266-13-4 from the chamberlain for his pension for the

---

49. ER, iv, 39.

50. RMS, i, APP. 2, Index B, 7. ER, iii, 643, iv, lxxiii-lxxiv.

51. ER, iv, II, 39. The entry in the account of the customers of Perth recorded the pension, but in the margin was inserted 'respondebit camerarius'.

52. ER, iv, 446, 466. In 1416 the pension temporarily ceased after the death of sir John Stewart but in 1427, payments were resumed to his son, sir Walter Stewart of Railston.

53. ER, iv, 39.

years 1409 and 1410, but because of lack of funds and prior claims, he received only £214-16-8.[54] However, in contrast, the 1407-8 account of the chamberlain recorded a payment of £7-6-9 to the earl of Mar as part payment of his pension for the future Whitsun term.[55] In 1420 sir Thomas Stewart of Kelly received £53-6-8 as payment of his pension for the last four years, that is when the financial position of the chamberlain had eased sufficiently to make an allowance feasible.[56] However, one section of pensions which received full priority were those destined for the governor himself. From the accounts of the chamberlain, the duke of Albany received annual payment of 200 marks as keeper of Stirling castle, 200 marks from the customs of Cupar and Linlithgow for his retinue, homage and service to the late duke of Rothesay, £1,000 as his fee as governor and finally £136, granted in exchange for the lands of the Abthania of Dull, crown land which had been granted or promised to him.[57] In other words, £1,402-13-4 was extracted annually from the receipts of the chamberlain for the personal use of the governor and since full payment of these fees and annuities was recorded for each year of the regency, it would seem that they received priority of payment.

In the early chamberlain accounts of the regency the governor and later the duke of Albany attempted to achieve full payment of his fee as governor. By 1409, Albany had received payment of £2,466-8-5 of the £3,000 due to him for his fee as governor for the period 1405 to 1408, leaving a debt of £533

---

54. Payments were made as follows:-
1409 account £81.10s.
1410 account £122-17-2.
1412 account £10-6-8. ER, iv, 101, 131, 163.

55. ER, iv, 70.

56. ER, iv, 335.

57. ER, iv, 38-9. RMS, i, 554. Chamberlain's accounts of 1373 revealed that the rents of Dull had been uplifted by Alexander Stewart 'Wolf of Badenoch' and before 1397 a greater part of the lands of Dull was granted to Robert, duke of Albany, who, instead of taking up the farms, received an annuity of £136. The ancient Monastery of Dull had become secularised at the time of Abbot Crinan and the lands retained the title of the Abthania or monastery. The concession in question represented only a small portion of the original holding. ER, iii, 425, 427.

which seems to have remained unpaid.[58] In addition, mention was made of other debts incurred by him on state affairs which had as yet not been repaid, in 1407-8 a memorandum mentioned his expenses concerning the visit of Richard of England and the costs of the frequent visits of messengers from France and Wales concerning these events. Albany seems to have incurred heavy expenses which were still outstanding on account of a shortage of royal revenue,[59] in 1414 Albany repeated the former claim and the additional expenditure of two expeditions to Lochgilp ('Polgilb') and Ross to pacify the lord of the Isles,[60] and finally, in 1417, the governor asserted that he had not received his expenses for the upkeep of Richard of England for the last eleven years, estimated by the auditors at 100 marks annually.[61] It is impossible to say whether the duke of Albany ever received repayment of these debts or whether they were abandoned after the political revolution of 1424. But they do reveal how the governor was required to subsidise governmental expenses from his own private resources.

In addition, a further £200 was allowed annually to the governor and later the earl of Buchan for his fee as chamberlain.[62]

Other concessions and gifts, although recorded in the accounts of the chamberlain, were not included in the actual charge. 10 marks of the annual rent from the lands of Craigforth ceased to be included in the charge from 1407-8 since the governor conceded the cash to the newly established

58. ER, iv, 103.

59. ER, iv, 80.

60. ER, iv, 213.

61. ER, iv, 289. Richard of England was an imposter for the deceased Richard II, murdered in 1400, and was adopted by the Scots for his nuisance value. Apparently he was discovered in the kitchen of the lord of the Isles. Balfour-Melville, James I, King of Scots, 23.

62. ER, iv, 67, 101, 133, 189, 212, 238.

chaplain in Stirling castle, who received a 10 mark salary in mortmain to pray for the souls of previous Scottish Monarchs.[63] Albany seems to have been a consistent benefactor to the church, for, in the same year, £20 of the relief of William Erskine of Kynoule was given in alms to the Dominican Friars of Perth.[64] However, lay society also benefited. In 1410, the chamberlain was not charged with the farm of the lands of Drava in the lordship of Stobow, since it was remitted by the governor to sir Simon Glendonewyne and a further £56-13-4 from the customs returns of 42½ sacks of wool was conceded to the earl of Douglas.[65]

The chamberlain's accounts reflected the extent of Albany's reliance on the leading magnates for the military defence of both the highlands and the English border. Many of the principal landholders in the north and south of Scotland were paid large sums of money by the chamberlain in order to preserve the security of the country. Such allowances were frequently made under the heading 'pro utilitate reipublice et quiete regni'. In the north the impact of the expedition of the lord of the Isles in 1411, culminating in the battle of Harlaw, stimulated the duke of Albany into action. Responsibility for the protection of the northern areas devolved mainly on Alexander Stewart, earl of Mar, who, in return for his military and administrative services, received large sums of money from the chamberlain and other sources. In 1412, the chamberlain contributed £122-17-4 to the earl in reward and recompense for his part in the victory of Harlaw and in the following year a further £100 was forthcoming.[66]

---

63. ER, iv, 68. RMS, i, 895. It would appear that the grant of 20 marks annual rent from Craigforth was granted to Robert, duke of Albany, for a debt due to him by Robert III. ER, iii, 343, 349.

64. ER, iv, 68.

65. ER, iv, 130.

66. ER, iv, 163, 189.

Other bulwarks of royal authority in the highlands also received financial aid, in 1413 £24 was submitted to various captains in lands north of Ross and in 1414 Kenneth Murchirson of Ross was allowed £10 for his services to the crown.[67] In addition, the chamberlain was required to sustain part of the expense for the reconstruction of the royal castle at Inverness, which, under the earl of Mar, was to provide one of the principal bases for controlling the highland areas. After Harlaw, the reconstruction of the castle continued for several years under the directions of the earl of Mar. Total payments for the building of the castle and for garrisoning it recorded in the Exchequer Rolls amounted to £640, of which the chamberlain contributed £185.[68] In 1416, £20 was allowed for victualling certain vessels bound for the north to combat Highland unrest.[69] Much of the effort in preserving the security of the English marches fell naturally on the most powerful of the border barons, mainly the earl of Douglas and to a lesser extent the earl of March. Douglas received cash both from the accounts of the customers and from those of the chamberlain in return for his services against the English and for his efforts at preserving order in the borders.[70] Also, in 1410 neither the sheriffs nor the chamberlain accounted for the issues of the justice ayres held south of the Forth by the earl of Douglas, as he had undoubtedly pocketed the proceeds.[71] Reliance on powerful magnates to preserve order and maintain security on the northern and southern extremities of Scotland was, although the only possible course open to Albany, an expensive policy, for

---

67. ER, iv, 189, 211.

68. ER, iv, lxxvi - lxxviii, 163, 211.

69. ER, iv, 265.

70. ER, iv, 132, 163, 189. For payments from the customs, see the chapter on the custumars' accounts.

71. ER, iv, 133.

between 1409 and 1416, a total of £2,073 was allowed in the accounts of the chamberlain to recompense for the services of these magnates.

Diplomatic expenses were also sustained by the chamberlain. It was the latter's responsibility to offset the expenses not only of embassies sent from Scotland to foreign courts, but also of embassies from foreign kings during their sojourn in Scotland. Concerning the former, the majority of embassies sent by the duke of Albany were destined for England 'on the king's business', that is to negotiate for his release from captivity in England. These diplomatic incursions into England were both frequent and expensive. In 1414 £120 was paid to master Robert Laing and sir Robert Maxwell of Calderwood for two diplomatic missions to England for discussions on the possible release of James I and, in the following year, a further £50 was paid to the same ambassadors for a similar mission.[72] Safe conducts issued to both these men and on 22 May a commission under the great seal of the governor was issued to the ambassadors relating that the intention of the embassy was to secure the release of James, styled 'son of the late king', and to receive the oath of Henry V on the confirmation of the Anglo-French truce.[73] Earlier, £130 was issued to Robert Laing, sir John Stewart of Lorne and John Busby, canon of Moray, for the cost of an embassy to England to negotiate for the release of both James I and the governor's son, Murdoch.[74] Because these and other embassies sent to England had been unsuccessful in obtaining the release of the king, many historians have assumed that they were frustrated by the sinister plotting of Albany. Although it is possible that Albany employed these embassies as a mere diplomatic 'front' to subdue such rumours, nevertheless both Henry IV and his son found James I, unlike Murdoch Stewart, an indispensable

---

72. ER, iv, 211, 238.

73. Balfour-Melville, James I, King of Scots, 58.

74. ER, iv, 163.

diplomatic factor to counter Scottish activity in the Anglo-French conflict. In addition, embassies were also sent to France, John Busby's visit in 1410 cost £50, and two years later, sir John Stewart, John Gray and John of Leith were sent, at a cost of £232, to France and then to the Papal Curia.[75] In reverse, it was customary for the expenses of visiting diplomats to be sustained by the host country. In 1413 the chamberlain was required to meet the expenses of a knight and an esquire of France on embassy to Scotland, which amounted to £100.[76]

The earl of Douglas was recompensed in 1412 to the tune of 100 marks for the expenses of holding a truce day on the English march.[77] Diplomatic expenses were a regular feature of the chamberlain's discharge and between 1410 and 1412, a total of £628 was expended. Apart from cash actually absorbed by these embassies, there was a sizeable wastage. In 1412 a total of £200 was needlessly wasted when an embassy bound for France was delayed, incurring heavy expenses and freight costs, and eventually the mission was cancelled with none of the outlay being returned. The following year, £50 allocated for the expenses to the lord of Graham and Master Robert Laing on their diplomatic mission to England was forcibly seized from the depositors by William Borthwick.[78]

The chamberlain was required to sustain the annual expenses of the exchequer. Between 1410 and 1421 exchequer costs do not seem to have varied to any great extent, amounting to £164 at the former and £171 at the latter date.[79] The largest single cost was the expenses of the

---

75. ER, iv, 133, 163.

76. ER, iv, 189.

77. ER, iv, 163.

78. ER, iv, 163, 189. Borthwick was noted for plundering the great customs. ER, iv, 144, 244, 322.

79. ER, iv, 128-32, 353-7.

auditors, averaging around 75% of the entire sum, but other items included £22 annually for fee and robes of the clerk of the register, fees for various servants, robes for the doorkeepers, carriage of the rolls, the purchase of parchment, tables, benches, counters, stools, provisions and horse fodder and payments to the clerks copying out the rolls.

Most other items in the chamberlain's discharge tended to be of a miscellaneous nature. In 1412 £22 was spent on the repair of Stirling castle and on the construction of a chapel and in 1413 a further £25 was expended on the same buildings.[80] From the issues of the chamberlain ayres, second teinds were paid to the bishop of Aberdeen from the burghs of Aberdeen, Banff, Cullen and Kintore, the bishop of Brechin from the burgh of Bervy and the prior of Restenneth from the burghs of Dundee, Montrose and Forfar.[81] Part of the cost of producing a great seal for the duke of Albany was met by the chamberlain.[82] The regency of the duke of Albany was notorious for its lawlessness, a feature from which the accounts of the chamberlain did not escape. In 1407 £29-2s was taken by force by the lord of Brechin, apparently a notorious criminal, from William Currour, servant of the late Adam Forrester.[83]

Although there was considerable co-operation between the accounts of the deputy chamberlain, the chamberlain on his own account ('per se') and the chamberlain on behalf of the governor, it is possible, nevertheless, to evaluate the overall solvency of the accounts of the chamberlain during the period of Albany's regency. Not unnaturally, a declining income and a relatively static discharge resulted in a steadily mounting deficit.

---

80. ER, iv, 164, 189.

81. ER, iv, 36, 66, 100, 102, 129, 162, 211, 237, 430, 671.

82. ER, iv, 69. There was an allowance of £14. A further 50 marks was paid from the customs accounts of Aberdeen for the silver. ER, iv, 87.

83. ER, iv, 37.

At first, until 1410, an adverse balance was recorded only in the accounts of the deputy although the governor never received his full fee of £1,000 during that period, but from 1410 until 1422, there was a gradual decline in the fiscal position of the chamberlain. In 1412 the deficit amounted to £305, by 1417 it had risen to £2,050, and in the final account of 1422 it had increased to £4,392.[84] There is little doubt that, under the existing situation, the adverse financial position of the chamberlain's accounts would have resulted in a serious fiscal crisis had they been permitted to continue.

Evidence concerning the fate of feudal casualties and the issues of justice ayres is extremely scanty and there are only a few such receipts in the chamberlain's accounts. On 3 August 1406 the governor conceded to William Hay of Errol the casualty of relief of all the lands owned by his father in return for the payment of 200 marks as specified in the agreement. This represented an early type of composition whereby the grantee paid a sum smaller than the full value of the casualty, a policy later adopted by the treasurer, especially under James IV.[85] However, royal revenue was being eaten away by the desire on the part of Robert II, III and the Albanys to gain the support of the higher nobility. In 1397 the earl of Angus was granted all the fines from all the courts held inside the sheriffdom of Forfar, which included the justice ayres.[86] On 16 November 1420, Murdoch, duke of Albany entered into an indenture with Alexander, earl of Mar, in which the latter bound himself to Murdoch before all men excepting the king, and in return Murdoch granted away a considerable portion of royal revenue and rights. The earl received half the profits of the office of justiciary north of the Forth, half the rents of

---

84. See Appendix No.B/7(b)

85. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iii, 134. ER, iv, 68. This privilege was a traditional gift enjoyed by the Hays.

86. RMS, i, Appendix, 2, 1755. Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, 41.

the lands of Badenoch, Urquhart and Strathavon after they had been 'let to advantage', Murdoch's refusal to countenance the possible marriage of his son, Walter, with the daughter of sir Robert Erskine, heiress to the earldom of Mar which Alexander held as a liferenter, and finally the governor was to infeft Thomas Stewart, only son of earl Alexander, in the earldom of Mar in fee and heritage.[87] Such an agreement revealed not only a total disregard of royal patrimony, but also a willingness on the part of Albany to ignore the laws of succession. But, on the other hand, it was only through concession that Murdoch could hope to attract the allegiance of upper sections of the nobility, who were used to central weakness and excessive largesse.

In 1424 an administrative revolution was effected by James I, which proved to be as complete as it was sudden. Early in 1424, James I returned to Scotland after eighteen years captivity in England with two overriding aims; firstly to curb the long established political power of the higher nobility and secondly to establish a firm political basis for the crown. The former was achieved principally through the execution and forfeiture of Murdoch, duke of Albany and his family. The exact reasons for the fall of the Albanys are not recorded, but the monopoly retained by them over the finances of the crown through the office of chamberlain, may well have been a factor.[88] In order to establish a powerful, independent monarchy, it was essential that James retained a firm grip on royal finances. In this, he was aided by the forfeited estates of the house of Albany and the fiscal benefits accruing from the revocation of numerous pensions and hereditary grants derived from the customs and chamberlain accounts. But perhaps the principal contribution originated from alterations in the fiscal

---

87. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 181.

88. Financial considerations were also probably at the bottom of the sudden fall of the Livingstones in 1449.

machinery. The financial powers of the chamberlain were fairly drastically cut and central responsibility for royal finances was largely split between the newly created offices of comptroller and treasurer. In place of an office largely connected with the principal magnetial family in the realm, James substituted two posts with distinct powers, whose responsibility was in fact, as well as in theory, to the king.

In this task, James I was assisted by a stroke of good fortune in the timely death of the chamberlain, John, earl of Buchan, killed at the battle of Verneuil in France. The vacant post was filled by sir John Forrester of Corstorphin, deputy chamberlain since 1405, a man of lairdly rather than noble stock, who seems to have been favoured by James. Between 10 July 1424 and 23 February 1924-5, sir John and his son Henry seem to have made considerable additions to their landed patrimony through royal concessions, wadsets, purchases and gifts.[89] In addition, sir John Forrester received two royal confirmations of his estates and he also seems to have held the office of Master of the King's household.[90] Subsequent appointments to the office of chamberlain reaffirmed the aristocratic nature of the post, although it had ceased in fact to be one of the principal offices of the state. However, the occupants of the office tended to reflect the political situation; in the reign of James II, James, Lord Livingstone, before the crisis of 1449 and after his reconciliation in 1454, and sir James Crichton of Frendraugh, in the reign of James III, Robert, lord Boyd, James, earl of Buchan, and David, earl of Crawford, and during the sway of James IV, the office was the monopoly of lord Hume.

With the financial revolution of 1424 the accounts of the chamberlain tended to disappear from record. However, two accounts for the reign of James I have survived, namely 1425-6 and 1434-5. There is no surviving

---

89. RMS, ii, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 23, 25, 26, 33.

90. RMS, ii, 4, 7, 17.

chamberlain account for the year 1424-5, but the accounts of the customers and burgh baillies seem to suggest that the chamberlain still retained ultimate responsibility for royal income although actual receipt was made by a variety of 'receivers', including the comptroller and treasurer. Presumably the alteration in royal financial organisation had not been sufficiently advanced to affect the accounts audited in 1425. In the account of 1426, there was a severe reduction in the revenue collected from the days of Albany. Receipts from the customers, burgh baillies and sheriffs declined to only £245-5-5, yet the chamberlain collected £244 from the issues of the chamberlain ayres- under the financial revival of James I income from this source multiplied several times from that collected during the regency of Albany[91]- and £41 from fines for those convicted of fore-stalling, namely, the attempt to corner supplies by purchasing victuals before they reached the burgh and reselling them in the burgh at a higher price.[92] The total income to the chamberlain amounted to £530. In 1435, the chamberlain's charge amounted to £738, £361 from the issues of the chamberlain ayre, £342 from forestalling and £36 from fines of burgesses for wrong judgements within the burghs of Inverkeithing and Dundee.[93] The exploitation of the issues of burgh justice by James I was a further example of his determination to extract the maximum from all sections of royal patrimony. After 1428 the customers and burgh baillies submitted no further funds to the chamberlain. Apart from exchequer expenses, second

---

91. Compared with the last three receipts from the chamberlain ayres during the regency.

1418-20	£7-13-4 (Two years)
1420-1	£151-6-8.
1421-2	£75

92. ER, iv, 428-30. MacKenzie, The Scottish Burghs, 63.

93. ER, iv, 668-70.

teinds to certain ecclesiastics from the issues of the ayres, and remissions from fines for forestalling (£245 in 1435), the remainder of the receipts were submitted to the king or his 'receivers', £271 in 1426 and £668 in 1435.[94]

After the loss of his financial powers, the chamberlain, much reduced in status, still retained his other duties, especially supervision over burghal affairs. Throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, since at least the thirteenth century, the chamberlain exercised supervision over the royal burghs by means of his ayre, a regular circuit court under the aegis of the chamberlain or his deputy.[95] The 1399-1400 account of a chamberlain ayre in Aberdeen revealed the financial arrangements of those local accounts. Of a total expense of £27-13-4, 20 marks was paid to the king (of which £10 was deducted for the annual pension of William Camera), 2 marks was submitted to the bishop of Aberdeen for his tenth penny and the remainder contributed towards the overall expenseoof the court.[96] In fact the percentage of the gross income from the ayre paid to the crown was relatively low. During the fifteenth century after 1424, isolated references in the burgh records revealed that chamberlain ayres continued to be held, although there is no way of assessing their regularity. It would appear that part of the expenses of the ayres were sustained by the burgh treasury. On 20 November 1458, £4-12s was drawn from the burgh coffers

---

94. ER, iv, 430-1, 670-1.

95. ER, i, ii. Considerable evidence for the fourteenth century. From 1358 the net profits from the chamberlain ayres were received by the chamberlain. ER, iii, 2, 48, 73, 111, 363, 432, 499, 584.

96. For details of the chamberlain's account and list of fines and apprisals, see Dickinson, A Chamberlain's Ayre in Aberdeen. SHR, xxxiii, 27, 36. Aberdeen Burgh Records 149-150. Grant of pension to William Camera seems to have endured from 1397 until 1411 or 1412. ER, iii, 430, iv, 162. RMS, i, APP, ii, Index A, 1740.

to pay for the chamberlain's expenses in Peebles.[97] In the 1490 fragment of the account of George Atkinson, rentmaster of the burgh of Lanark, 2s was allowed in his discharge for the chamberlain's chaplain and in 1507 40s was expended on wine for 'my lord of Lennox in the ayr'.[98] In May 1512 the burgh of Aberdeen was making arrangements for the raising of a 'stent' or local tax of £500 'for the relieving of the justice ayr and chaumerlane ayr of the burghe.'[99] However, as the fifteenth century progressed, the evidence seems to suggest that the control exercised by the chamberlain over the burghs was becoming increasingly less effective, and also that the efficiency and honesty of the chamberlain ayre was being questioned. In March 1457-8 Parliament called for the reform of the annual ayre 'the quhilkis all the estatis and specialy the pure comownis ar fairly grevyt'.[100] In the 1470s issues from the chamberlain ayres were accounted for by the burgh baillies, part of the profits of which were paid to the chamberlain for his fee and the remainder submitted to central fiscal officials.[101] This arrangements appears to have been temporary, for such entries disappeared from the burgh accounts in subsequent decades. The only other reference occurred in the treasurer's account of 1511-12, when compositions were employed as the means of collecting the issues from certain ayres.[102] They were settled on the fines of the chamberlain ayres of Dundee, Perth (both inside and outside the burgh) and Cupar, to the tune of £1,766-13-4. In the discharge certain expenses of the above ayres were

---

97. Charters and Documents and Extracts from the Records of the burgh of Peebles, 129-30.

98. Extracts from Records of the Royal Burgh of Lanark, 7, 16.

99. Extracts from the Council Register of Aberdeen, i, 442.

100. APS, ii, 50. From 1480s the Lords of the Council were assuming jurisdiction over burghal cases. ADC, i, 12, 14, 24, ii, 111-2, 139, 419.

101. ER, vii, 433-9, 512-8, 593-7, 666-72, viii, 102-116.

102. TA, iv, 370.

sustained by the treasurer; the bishop of Aberdeen received £40 as part of his expenses for 20 days service, £50 to the treasurer, £20 sir Adam Crichton, deputy chamberlain, at the rate of £1 a day, and £12 to Master James Henrieson, the king's advocate.[103] In the sixteenth century, even the chamberlain's power in this sphere suffered serious setbacks. In 1517 the last reference to the chamberlain ayre was recorded,[104] and in 1535, supervision of royal burgh finances was vested in the Auditors of the Exchequer.[105]

103. TA, iv, 162-3, 320.

104. TA, v, 109, ADC, xxx, f 77.

105. APS, ii, 349.

THE PROBLEM OF THE COINAGE AND PRICE INDEX

Any sketch of the development and administration of the late Mediaeval mint in Scotland is hampered by a drastic shortage of material. Only the records from the Acts of Parliament and the twenty accounts of the Master of the Mint, recorded in the Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, along with surviving coins and hoards provide any tangible information concerning the Scottish coinage.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century the officers engaged in the royal mint consisted of the Warden ('custos monete') and the Master of the Mint ('Magister Monete'), assisted by printers and strikers. The duties of these royal servants were detailed in the 1393 Act of Parliament. The Warden was to receive all the bullion brought to the moneyer (or master of the mint) and to check the weight which was to be entered in a register. The warden retained custody of the coining implements when not in use, and, in addition, each days supply of newly minted coins which were placed in a special chest at the termination of every week. Responsibility for the weight and the standard of the coinage rested with the warden.[1] In 1434 a special engraver ('sculptor ferrorum') was engaged with a fee proportional to the amount of gold and silver which passed through his hands.[2] A Parliamentary Act of 1451 recorded that the warden was responsible for the weight of the coinage but that the moneyer was to answer for all the gold and silver until the warden had taken 'assay tharof and put it in this boist, ande that na man sal tak the said mone fra it be burlit and clippit bot at his awin liking'. In addition, the Act stated that the warden retained the power to chose all his servants and was also empowered to mete out punishment.[3] In 1487-8 the proliferation of false currency and the

---

1. APS, i, 207-8.
2. ER, iv, 578.
3. APS, ii, 40.

existance of two moneyers encouraged the issuing of a statute which related that only one moneyer was to be responsible for the coinage thus facilitating discovery of the source of the false issues, and, in addition to the warden, a 'wislar' or exchanger was to be appointed.[4] The mint officials were directly responsible to the crown and tended to receive fees directly proportional to the amount of precious metal employed in minting the specie. In 1447 both the warden of the mint and the engraver each received 11/- as fees for the year, calculated at one penny for every twelve ounces of gold and silver minted.[5]

No attempt will be made to deal with the actual methods and materials employed in producing the various currencies, such details are available in Cocran-Patrick's treatice on the Scottish coinage.[6] However, it would appear that the mint was a mobile institution, often following the movements of the king from whom it received its directive. The mint was established in several burghs, Edinburgh, Aberdeen Linlithgow, Perth, Stirling and Berwick.[7] In the sixteenth century a special building was constructed to house the mint but prior to that event, allowances were recorded in the moneyers' accounts to pay for the hire of a private dwelling. In 1436 and 1437 an allowance of £3-13-4 was submitted to Robert Niddrie for the annual rent of a house near the port of Kirkstyle in Edinburgh which was occupied by the mint.[8] Between 1440 and 1448 the house of John Swift, burgess of Edinburgh, was frequently rented at the annual cost of £2-13-4.[9]

---

4. APS, ii, 182. The office of exchanger was probably previously held by the warden.
5. ER, v, 278.
6. Cocran-Patrick, Records of the Coinage of Scotland, i, xlviii-lv.
7. ER, iv, 89, 102, 278. APS, ii, 233. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, 167 (a complete chart of Mediaeval mints).
8. ER, v, 66.
9. ER, v, 103, 119, 128, 131, 278, 303.

The crown was entitled to collect seignorage, the right of the king to a percentage of the bullion minted into coins. Although the evidence is meagre, some impression concerning the nature of the gain achieved by the crown from striking coins is available. In 1358 Adam Thore, warded of the mint, was in receipt of 7d from every pound of silver minted, making a total profit to the crown of £108-5-2, and since in 1367 a pound weight of silver was minted into 352 pennies, the ratio of seignorage to a pound weight of silver represented approximately 2%.[10] However, by 1441 the rate of seignorage to the crown on a pound of silver had risen to 5/- for pennies and 5/4 for groats, while, from every pound of gold the king extracted 16/-.[11] Although the rate seems to have fallen drastically in 1464 to 1/4 for each pound of silver converted into pennies, 2/8 for every pound of silver commuted into groats and 12/- on each pound of gold, by 1526 20/- was extracted for a pound of silver and 26/- from the equivalent in gold.[12]

Between 1433 and 1487 twenty two accounts of the master of the mint have survived. Apart from the account of the two years from 1466 to 1468, the revenue received by the crown was not extensive, During the decades 1433-43, 1443-53, 1458-68, the average annual yield from the mint to the crown amounted to £56, £16 and £16 respectively.[13] Apart from the years 1433 to 1440, when a total of almost 100 lbs. of gold and 800 lbs. of silver was commuted into official currency at a profit of £342 to the crown, neither James II nor his son seem to have extracted vast gains from this source.[14] In fact the years 1452-3 and 1456-7 revealed that no gold coins were issued at all.[15] The mint accounts revealed the sporadic nature of currency output. For instance, between 1442 and 1450, 283 lbs. of silver

---

10. ER, i, 615.
11. ER, v, 102.
12. ER, vii, 291. Cochran-Patrick, Records of the Coinage of Scotland, i, xxxix.
13. See Appendix. No.B/10(a)These figures represented the gross receipts of the master of the mint.
14. ER, iv, 577, 625, v, 65. 89.
15. ER, v, 556, vi, 311.

was converted into groats but between 1452 and 1464, of which only eight years were recorded in accounts, a total of 1,375 lbs of silver was minted into the same coin. Similarly, between July 1443 and June 1444 16 lbs of silver was minted into pennies, in the surviving accounts for the next thirteen years there wer no entries under this section, but in the single year 1458-9 a total of 204 lbs. of silver was commuted into pennies.[16]

Although the majority of the surviving accounts of the master of the mint for the reigns of James, I, II and III dealt only with the minting of gold and silver currency, the account of Alexander Tod and William Goldsmith in 1468 recorded the seignorage derived from the minting of black money. For the first year of the account, namely from June 1466 to sometime in 1467, the accountants were charged with £650 through a composition arranged between the king and the lords of the council on the one hand and Tod and Goldsmith on the other. However, it would appear that the real profit due to the crown was slightly smaller for the comptroller was responsible for the collection of only £565-19-8, the remainder being lost as the black farthings were at first valued at a halfpenny ('pro obolis') but was later reduced by half to a farthing ('Pro quadrantes').[17]

The expenses sustained by the masters of the mint were not very considerable, only the cost of hiring a private dwelling to house the mint and the small fees payable to the warden of the mint and the engravers. In 1464 £2-9/- was allowed to William Goldsmith for a silver collar gifted to Dederic Grutar and £14-11-3 was paid in return for a loan to James II and for his stipend for making certain silver articles when the king's army travelled to Roxburgh.[18] A substantial proportion of the gross receipts was paid over to the crown or its representatives. In the accounts of

---

16. See Appendix No. B/10(a)

17. ER, vii, 581.

18. ER, vii, 292.

1434 and 1435 the entire balances of £72 and £92 respectively were incorporated within the overall account of Robert Gray, master of the mint, master of work at Edinburgh Castle and for the royal barge at Leith, and, in 1438 the profits from the mint were employed to clear Gray's overexpenditure of £433 for 1436.[19] Between 1436 and 1441 sir William Crichton, chancellor, derived over £100 from the profits of the mint,[20] but from the latter date, any surplus cash tended to be submitted to royal receivers, namely Thomas Bully, steward of the household between 1442 and 1444, Alexander Guthrie, treasurer, between 1463 and 1465 and, on other occasions, the comptroller. Interesting receipts were recorded in 1453 when the entire profit from the royal mint of £45-3-4 was received by master James Lindsay,[21] the queen's steward, and in 1476 when £56-8-4 was paid directly into the king's own coffers through the receipt of William Schevez.[22] In the accounts for 1448 and 1450 no submissions were recorded as being transferred to any royal fiscal official and the surplus was assigned in the arrears.[23] Most of the payments from these accounts tended to be small monent, except in 1468 when £565-19-8 was paid to the comptroller.[24] Unfortunately no further accounts of the master of the mint have survived for the latter half of the reign of James III and for the entire reign of James IV.

---

19. ER, iv, 577, 625, v, 67. By 1440 the overexpenditure had been reduced to £103 which Gray was to redeem from the customs. In his account of 1447 part of his overexpenditure as custumar of the English goods at Edinburgh of £66-0-4 was absorbed into his account as master of the mint. ER, v, 91, 279.

20. ER, v, 67, 91, 103.

21. ER, v, 556.

22. ER, viii, 392.

23. ER, v, 303, 389. The accumulated arrears seem to have been settled between July 1450 and May 1452 although no intervening accounts have survived.

24. ER, vii, 581.

'In the long run every monetary unit is subject to a process of progressive depreciation. The extent of this depreciation varies greatly from unit to unit and age to age, but the phenomenon itself is universal'.[25] Throughout Mediaeval Europe currency debasement as a prominent feature; in Italy and France depreciation tended to occur fairly rapidly during the Middle Ages whereas in England the coinage demonstrated a greater degree of stability. Compared with the city stated of Italy the economic developement of England was considerably delayed, but, the favourable balance of trade achieved by England through the substantial Continental demand for English wool and subsequently manufactured cloth ensured the constant influx of precious metals. Debasement of the coinage was the result of a decline in the precious metal content or the intrinsic value of money. That is, in any specific monetary denomination, the gold or silver content in the coins involved became increasingly less prominent as the currency was devalued.

In common with the rest of Eruope, the coinage in Scotland suffered from persistent debasement. Before the wars of independance the effect of any fall in the value of money was less dramatic in the non monetised economy of thirteenth century Scotland. For instance, rents or farms tended to be submitted to the landlord in grain and livestock which retained their intrinsic value in the face of currency fluctuations.[26] As in England, the demand for money in Scotland had not developed to any extent by the mid thirteenth century as it had in the commercially developed urban communities of Northern and Central Italy. Knowledge of the early history of the Scottish currency is extremely scanty before the reign of David II but it appears to have retained a fairly respectable level of purity, not dissimilar in standard to its counterpart in England. However, the financial

---

25. Cipolla, 'Currency Depreciation in Mediaeval Eruope', EC.Hist.Rev., 2nd Series, xv, 413.

26. ER, i, 1-51.

difficulties experienced by David II, due principally to the large ransom of 100,000 marks demanded by the English on his release from captivity, initiated a policy of currency debasement which was to outstrip that in England and most other countries in Eruope. The official rates of exchange as recorded in the Acts of Parliament during the latter Middle Ages revealed frequent alterations in connection with foreign currencies during this period, normally to the disadvantage of Scottish specie. For instance, in 1398 the French crown was stated to be equivalent to 4/9 in Scots currency, by 1451 its value had been elevated to 6/8, in 1467 to 12/6, in 1475 to 13/4 and finally in 1489 the statutory rate of exchange was fixed at 15/-.[27] Other alien coins were revalued in Scotland in a similar fashion, between 1398 and 1451 the Flemish noble rose in value from 9/4 to 12/8,[28] the French salut from 6/8 to 16/- between 1451 and 1489,[29] Flemish ridars from 6/8 in 1451 to 15/- in 1489,[30] English Harry nobles from 22/- in 1456 to 32/- in 1488 and finally 38/- in 1512 [31] and finally the French Lewis from 15/6 to 18/- in the short period between 1467 and 1488.[32] Despite Parliamentary regulations fixing the value attached to each foreign and native coin, there can be little doubt that exchange rates varied. Even in the late fifteenth century accounts of the treasurer the Scottish crown was accepted for different values, namely 12/-, 12/10 and 14/- although the normal rate was fixed at 13/4.[33] In 1485 Parliament required that all the king's coin, including placks and half placks, were to retain a

---

27. APS, i, 210, ii, 40, 90, 112,212. A table of the value of foreign currency in Scotland in Cochran-Patrick, Records of the Coinage of Scotland, i, xcl-xciv.

28. APS, i, 210, ii, 40.

29. APS, ii, 40, 212

30. APS, ii, 40, 212

31. APS, ii, 46. TA, i, 167, ix, 315.

32. APS, ii, 88, 212. TA, i, 167.

33. TA, i, 410.

universal value throughout the entire realm and no subjects were either to refuse such currency or arbitrarily elevate their value under pain of death and escheate.[34] Frequent readjustment in currency exchange rates reflected the constantly changing situation and also the difficulties faced by Parliament in attempting to arrive at a true and realistic ratio. In 1467, for example, certain Lion coins were assessed in relation to Scottish numismatic valuations but a proportion of the foreign coins appear to have been overestimated since their exchange rates were lowered the following year. In 1468 the English Harry noble, assessed at 27/6 in 1467, was reduced to 24/- while the new English groat of Edward possessed an exchange rate of 10d in 1466, in 1467 the rate was elevated to 1/-, but in the following year it was reduced to 11d.[35] However, not all foreign currencies were altered at every revaluation, In 1468 the Demy, Lyon, groat, crown, groat of Fleurs de Lis, small penny, farthing were to run at the same value as they were allocated in Parliament of October 1467.[36]

Both the Scottish and English currencies suffered from the effects of persistent debasement during the fifteenth century. In 1451 the English groat was valued at 8d Scots, but by 1467 its assessment had been elevated to 1/4.[37] However, by 1466 a new English groat of Edward had been issued to be equivalent to 10d Scots 'and no dearer', by 1467 its value had risen to 1/- although in the following year it was reduced to 11d in Scots currency.[38] Occasionally the value of foreign coins in Scotland was not fixed to any exact figure. In 1451 the English penny

---

34. APS, ii, 172. As was custumary in such cases, informers were granted half the escheate of those convicted.

35. APS , ii, 88, 90.

36. APS, ii, 88, 90.

37. APS, ii, 40, 88.

38. APS, ii, 86, 88, 90.

was to be exchanged at a rate fixed by the 'will of the receiver'.[39] Although the corresponding debasement of the English currency temporarily helped to narrow the gap between the Scottish and English coin valuations, the overall trend reacted against the former. Once a gap had been opened up between the currencies of both countries sometime after 1355, the gulf widened fairly steadily; by the 1390s the Scottish pound was equivalent to 10/- in England, by the 1450s to 6/8, and by the early sixteenth century it was only worth 5/-.[40]

The steady devaluation of the Scottish currency proceeded throughout the late Mediaeval period. The silver content in the Scottish coin fell consistantly. During the fourteenth century, the amount of pennies minted from an ounce rose only from 22 in 1320 to 24.64 in 1385. However, the next two centuries witnessed a dramatic increase; by 1393 the number had risen to 44, by 1440 to 64, by 1451 to 96, by 1483 to 140 and finally, in 1542, one ounce of silver made up a total of 237 pennies.[41] Also, during the later Middle Ages the minting potential of both gold and silver increased dramatically; in 1320 a pound of silver was coined into 29/-, in 1385 into 33/- and in 1485 into 186/-, while in 1393 a pound of gold was minted into 640/- and in 1483 the total had reached 1,920/-.[42] Having started, the rate of debasement accelerated in the form of a geometric progression during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

---

39. APS, ii, 40.

40. Cochran-Patrick, Records of the Coinage of Scotland, i, PP LXXVI
For the dowry of Margaret Tudor in 1403, the rate of exchange was 3:1 in favour of the English currency. TA, ii.

41. Cochran-Patrick, Records of the Coinage of Scotland, i, PP LXXV.
The Mediaeval Scots ounce is equivalent to 472.5 grams Modern Troy.

42. Cochran-Patrick, Records of the Coinage of Scotland, i, LXXV-LXXVI.

At periodic intervals new coinages were ordered by the crown with the intention of elevating the current value of the coins. In 1424 James I decreed that 'the king sall ger strik new mone quhen him likis and thikis it speidful and profitable for thee realme'.[43] In 1451 a recoinage was ordered by James II in which new groats, eight to be made from a ounce of silver, valued at 8d and new gold lions, worth 6/8, were to be minted. This recoinage provided many interesting features, firstly the old currency was reduced in value, the fleur-de-lis groat from 6d to 4d and the gold demis from 9/- to 6/8, secondly the government was determined that the new issues were to maintain the same standrads and weight as corresponding English coins but such an aspiration was seemingly not achieved and thirdly there was every intention to subsequently raise the currency value of these new issues and even before the official Parliamentary announcement of their issue of 1456, the new lions rose in value to 10/- while the groat 'was cried up to 12d nocht ganstanding it was ordanyt to hair course for 8d'.[44] The new lion was declared to be 'th samyn wecht to the half Inglis nobil' but, valued at 6/8 it was, in fact, double the value of the half noble in England. At periodic intervals parliament reviewed and, if deemed necessary, revalued the coins still in circulation. For instance, in 1467 all the groats of David II and Robert II, termed the 'spurryt grot', were to be valued at 16d, the 'borage grot', probably from the reign of Robert II was also declared to 'run' for 16d, the 'grot of the croune' for 14d and the 'grot of the flour delyce' for 8d.[45] This valuating revealed the extent devaluation in late Mediaeval Scotland for, at issue, the groats of the reign of David II were valued at 4d and by the reign of James III, almost a

---

43. APS, ii, 6.

44. APS, ii, 40. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, 47. In the mint account for the year, 17 Mary 1452 to 19 June 1453 the Auditors of the Exchequer were recorded as having delivered assays of 12d groats. ER, vi, 556.

45. APS, ii, 88.

century later, they continued to circulate at four times their original value while the fleur-de-lis groat, reduced to 4d in 1451 was now valued at 8d.[46] There was a similar upgrading of the valuation of gold currency, in 1451 both the demis and the lions were equivalent to 6/8 but they were sonn elevated to 10/- and, in 1475, they were to pssess the value of 13/4, that is their worth had doubled in just over twenty years.[47] The Parliamentary rolls also contained evidence of variations in the silver content of groats. In 1451 eight groats were derived from an ounce of silver, in 1484 the number had risen to ten and, in the 1526 recoinage, eleven groats, each valued at 18d, originated from an ounce of silver.[48]

Debasement and currency difficulties seem to have begun with David II, especially following his return from captivity in England and the need to raise sufficient cash to pay his ransom. Although the Parilaiment of 1367 ordered the issue of a new coinage, 'of as good and pure metal as the money now made in the Kingdom of England' this desire was not achieved. Firstly 352 pennies instead of 300 were now issued from a pound of silver and secondly the weight of the currency was reduced. Prior to this stature, the official weight of the silver groat was estimated at 72 grains but subsequently the weight was reduced to just over 64 grains.[49] During the reign of Robert III there was a further reduction in the weight of the coinage, gold lions fell from just over 61 grains to 38 grains and the silver groat from 46 grain to about 28.[50] During the reign of James III there were three weights of silver groats, the heavy groat of 47 grains valued at 14d, the light groat of 39 grains worth 12d and finally the base

---

46. APS, i, 144.

47. APS, ii, 40, 46, 112.

48. APS, ii, 40, 166.

49. APS, i, 144.

50. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, 137-8.

groat of only 33 grains which was valued at 7d but reduced to 6d in 1471.[51] The latter coin, termed 'the new alayt grot of viid' belonged to the period following 1470.[52]

Parliamentary statutes recorded the anxiety of the government that the weight and fineness of Scottish coins should be maintained. Each coin was minted with the expressed desire that it should be equivalent to an English or foreign counterparts. In January 1488-9 a new gold panny was to be minted of the fineness and value of the French crown while a year later a groat of 14d was to retain a similar fineness to the Edward groat of England.[53] As een above, such a hope was rarely realised. In 1451 Parliament ordained that the new coinage was to be 'of ewin in wecht to the mone of Inglande', but the groat of Henry VI was struck at 60 grains in weight while the Scottish groat could only have weighed just over 58 grains and the heaviest groat of James III's reign only 47 grains.[54] However, attempts were made to test the weight and fineness of the coin issued at the Scottish mint. On 19 July 1438, in the presence of John, bishop of Moray, the treasurer, William Crichton and John Schevez (clerk of the register), a trial of the pix, a box in which sample coins were preserved for investigation, was undertaken. The pxi, closed and locked and contained gold coins and silver groats, pennies and halfpennies minted by Robert Gray, the king's moneyer during the reign of James I and the present monarch, was opened in the presence, and with the consent, of Gray. The gold and silver coins were extracted from the various sacks within the box, were weighed and tested for content and were found to have been without defect and the moneyer praised for his efficiency.[55] On 17 June 1453 the auditors of the Exchequer delivered to Alexander Napier, provost of Edinburgh seven assays

---

51. Ibid, 141.

52. APS, ii, 100.

53. APS, ii, 212, 221.

54. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, 47, 140-1.

55. ER, v, 67-8.

of gold coins, 24 groats of 12d and a panny, contained in a locked box representing the gold and silver currency issued between 17 May 1452 and 18 June the following year, which were to 'be kepit quhil the king wil ger assay the said assais'.[56] In 1451, following the new issue, a statute indicated that the moneyer was to answer for all gold and silver coins minted under him until the warden of the mint had taken 'assay thereof and put it in his boist'.[57] In 1473 the minting of placks and new pennies was to cease temporarily until it was checked if the latter contained 5/- of fine silver in the ounce as ordained and the placks were also to be examined, after which the coiner was to be punished if faults were discovered.[58]

Other, more debased types of coins appeared in the fifteenth century. From the early fifteenth century 'billon' coinage was issued by the mint.[59] Although these coins retained a silvery appearance, more than half the content was composed of alloy, probably copper. The Weight of these coins declined drastically during the century, for the billon pennies of James I weighed around 16 grains, those of James III's reign amounted to only 8 grains while those of James IV's reign were regarded as extremely 'base'.[60] During the reign of James III, two new billon coins were added, the plack and the half plack. In 1471 the further striking of new pennies and placks was to cease, they were to retain their current value and three persons were appointed to determine whether they had maintained their full silver standard.[61] The placks were minted at fifteen to the ounce of silver and so weighing around 31 grains. The were probably valued at 4d.

---

56. ER, vi, 556.

57. APS, ii, 40.

58. APS, ii, 105.

59. The word 'billon' was derived from the French 'billet', meaning base metal.

60. Steward, The Scottish Coinage, 138, 141, 145.

61. APS, ii, 100.

It was during the reign of James III that 'black money' made its first appearance. In 1466, during the ascendancy of the Boyd faction, black farthings were issued, four to a panny, minted at the rate of 64 to the ounce of silver and weighing just over 7 grains.[62] Between June 1466 and the same month 1467 the moneyers, Alexander Tod and William Goldsmith, were responsible for the issue of these farthings. They were first valued at a halfpenny each but £45 was subsequently deducted from the king's profit on account of the reduction in value to a quarter of a panny.[63] The statute of 1466 stated that the copper coinage was introduced 'for the eis and sustentacioun of the Kingis leigis and almous deide to be done to pure folk' and it continued that these coins should 'bas in payment for brede and ale and uthir merchiandice'.[64] As the panny represnted a high denomination of coin for the use of the poorer classes it was difficult for this section of society to cope. Apart from the desire to obtain financial profit from such actions, it is likely that the crown was making an attempt to ease the problems of his poorer subjects. It was stated in the statute that these coins were struck in copper. The experiment proved short lived for in the Parliament of 12 October 1467 the minting of black money was to halt on pain of death and sheriffs were instructed to seek out the origin of any such mints.[65] Between 1479 and 1482 James III repeated the expedient of the Boyds and reintroduced copper coinage which he attempted to pass off at an inflated value. This action was probable in response to James's immediate financial needs, exacerbated by the possibility of meeting the English invasion instigated by Alexander, duke of Albany. Although it provided the king with a temporary relief from his fiscal difficulties it was a dangerous expedient and by 1482 the black money had

---

62. APS, ii, 86.

63. ER, vii, 580-1.

64. APS, ii, 86.

65. APS, ii, 88.

obviously attracted considerable unpopularity. Most of the chroniclers place the responsibility for this issue on Cochran, the king's 'favourite', but it is unlikely that he retained such influence over royal policy and it is more probable that the king was entirely responsible for the black money. Cochran's role in the minting of black money was fancifully detailed by Pitscottie when he related that 'he got sic credence of the king that he gaif him leif to straik conzie of his awin as he had ben a prince; and quhen the wyffis wald refuse the said cunzie quhilk was callit ane Couchrinis plak and said to him that it wald be cryit doun'.[66] Doubtless Pitscottie was right in stressing the unpopularity of the debased currency but the importance of Cochran formed part of the myth of James III and his 'favourites', created by Pitscottie and other sixteenth century historians. Although this coinage was not in existance for any length of time its effect must have hit the merchant class and others lower in the social scale rather than the nobility who were probably less affected by the state of the coinage. It was stated that 'many pure folk deit of hungar' during the period of this issue.[67] The exact nature of the black money is uncertain but it was either of copper or of extremely base billon.

There are isolated references to the effect of this issue of black money. In the 1483 account of the custumars of Edinburgh an allowance of £180-16/- was permitted for payment to workmen 'that wrocht the blac money of oure command'.[68] Several accounts in the Exchequer Rolls recorded allowances to accountants for black money still in their possession at the time of the declamation. In 1484 the custumar of Edinburgh was allowed £440 as the money could not be put to the king's use and it was desirable that the custumar should suffer through currency manipulations.[69] In 1482

---

66. Pitscottie, History of Scotland, 169.

67. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, 53.

68. ER, ix, 218-9.

69. ER, ix, 286.

the chamberlain of the earldom of Carrick, John, lord Kennedy, claimed that he had received farms amounting to £51 in black money and because he had not paid the cash to the comptroller at that time he compounded with the royal council for thirty marts to be delivered to the comptroller, Alexander Lesley, at Rutherglen at the feast of St. Luke.[70]

The currency manipulations during the reign of James III went far towards destroying confidence in the coinage. Certain persons were taken to court for refusing to receive black money.[71] The receiver of Kinclaven was granted an allowance for at total of £217-10/-, the farms from the lands of the lordship for the Whitsun term of 1482, since both the accountant and the tenants had offered payment of the farms to the comptroller, Alexander Lesley of Wardris in black money but he had refused to accept the coins and the former were equally adamant in paying only in black money.[72] The comptroller had returned the black money and when the coins were cried down, the sum involved was declared lost. In 1486 it was declared that Thomas Simpson, a previous comptroller, had illegally refused to receive the sum of £105 in placks from James Douglas, chamberlain of the earldom of Moray, before the coins were cried down and the lords of the Council declared that Simpson was the king's debtor for the money and was to answer for the sum involved.[73] In the same year the custumars of English goods were forced to seek an allowance for placks which had since depreciated by two thirds.[74]

---

70. ER, ix, 196.

71. ADC, ii, CXVIII, CXXV.

72. ER, ix, 480.

73. ER, ix, 363.

74. ER, ix, 449.

Apart from occasional references to placks and black money in the reign of James III, there is little indication of the actual effect of the steady debasement of the Scottish currency in the financial accounts. In the final years of the reign of James I the effect of currency depreciation was recorded in the Exchequer accounts. The great customs and the property famrs were recorded in the old coin but the accountants' allowances were calculated in the new, the difference being around 20%. The result was that in 1434 gross customs charged to the custumar of Edinburgh amounted to £2,018 in the old coin but when commuted to the new issue the charge had risen to £2,421.[75]

Contemporary or near contemporary opinion tended to heap all the ills of the day on the effect of the presence of black money. It was significant to them that the worst period of debasement of the coinage, that is the three years from 1479, coincided with particularly bad harvests and dearth. Contemporary mention is made of the presence of famine and pestilence during those years and that the principal reasons for this situation wer the border clashes with England and the 'blak cunye in the realm'. Writing a century later, George Buchanan maintained that one of the grievances promulgated by the rebales at Lauder Bridge in 1482 was that the black money 'occasioned the dearness of every article of like and then even famine for dealers rather allowed their corn to rot than give it away to purchasers under the name of buying'.[76] It would seem that James III's black coinage was employed by historical writers as the scapegoat for the political and economic ills of the period. James III may have intented to utilize his issue of black money to solve his temporary financial difficulties for it provided a useful vehicle for clearing foreign debts and meeting heavy short term fiscal commitments but soon after 1482 the issue was halted. Whatever the short term benefits it brought to the crown in the long term the effect

---

75. ER, iv, 573.

76. Buchanan, History of Scotland, 208-9.

of the debasement could only increase the financial difficulties of the crown and the issue of such heavily debased currency only served to destroy confidence in the coinage.

A feature of the heavily debased currency issued by the crown during the fifteenth century was a reluctance on the part of many persons, even the king's comptroller, to accept payment in such coin. The crown was adamant that even the most debased coins of the realm should be accepted in financial transactions in the same way as any other specie. Also, in response to a certain reluctance in the acceptance of cracked or flawed coins, a statute of March 1503-4 legislated against the refusal of any coins which were current in Scotland at the time.[77]

Much of the trouble over the coinage in later Mediaeval Scotland stemmed from a lack of confidence in the currency produced. The persistant manipulation of the coinage resulted in the refusal to accept payment in the debased currency. In addition, private exchanges of cash would probably have paid little sttention to government dictates, partly because each party would be after the best terms in a particular settlement and partly because of ignorance of the official rate for specific coins. Confusion over the value of currency in Scotland must have resulted in considerable speculation and although acts were passed prohibiting the buying and selling of coined gold and silver and also the artitrary raising of the value of coins by individuals such activities would have been extremely difficult to control.[78]

The hoarding of coinage has generally been accepted as the result of military of political unrest or the uncertainty of an economic crisis but it would appear that some hoarding may have been savings during a time of prosperity. The substantial finds from the period 1280 to 1330 undoubtedly

---

77. APS, ii, 254.

78. APS, ii, 172, 215.

reflected the disruption resulting from the Scottish Wars of Independance but between 1377 and 1500 eleven deposits were found within Scotland.[79] As with all Mediaeval hoards, it was only the better standard of coins which were withdrawn from circulation leaving those of poorer quality to remain for general use. Most of these hoards contained substantial quantities of English coin, which was of much higher quality than those minted in Scotland and which again reflected the desire to retain good currency. At Aberdeen a find dating from around 1466 revealed a total of 178 English coins and only 5 Scottish while from Perth a deposit from the first three years of the reign of James IV contained 257 English and 857 Scottish coins of various denominations. It is interesting that the latter hoard also contained 436 placks which demonstrated that even debased coinage was collected in Scotland.[80] The crown also seems to have dealt with considerable quantities of foreign currency. Among the coins discovered in the massive hoard belonging to James III, which amounted to over £24,500, were 6331 Angel nobles, 54 French gold rials, 3,355¼ Rose nobles, 2,729 Harry nobles, 15 French ridars, 840 Lewis nobles and half Rose nobles, 706 French crowns, and £30 in Dutch gold.[81] From the evidence of payments made by the king's treasurer it is obvious that at least part of the currency handled by the crown or its representatives was of foreign origin. Foreign immigrants and artisans were frequently paid in non Scottish coins, for instance on 2 August 1508 Piers the painter received his monthly wage in 5 French crowns.[82] Also the king himself also seems to have worked with alien specie for in January 1507-8 James IV received 100 French crowns from the treasurer in order to play cards.[83]

---

79. For details, see Thompson 'Inventory of British Coin Hoards', Royal Numismatic Society, Special publication, No.1.
80. Ibid. No.1 and 309.
81. TA, i, 79-87, 166-7.
82. TA, iv, 138.
83. TA, iv, 93.

The problem of the coinage in the late Mediaeval period was aggravated by the proliferation of false coiners. On 4 August 1455 any person who effected the arrest of a false coiner and who brought him before the king was to receive a reward of £10 from the royal coffers and the escheated goods of the person convicted.[84] In 1485 dearth of victuals and the resultant rise in prices was said to be the result of a great abandance of counterfeit placks, minted both inside and outside Scotland, which seem to have been of such high standard that it was difficult to distinguish them from the royal currency. To counter the threat, all placks were to be recalled, melted down and their substance to form a new silver panny. For each plack, both true and false, surrendered, Thomas Tod and Alexander Livingstone were instructed to give 2d before 31 May.[85] In 1488 the difficulty in tracing the source of false coins and in supervising the honesty of the two masters of the money, the entire mint administration was reformed so that responsibility for coins minted could be more easily pinpointed.[86] Despite the obvious difficulties in tracing such illegal activitied there is evidence that some success was achieved. At the Edinburgh justice ayre, of April 1512 certain persons were bound to bring John Symonton of that ilk and William Inglis of Langlandhill to court to answer charges 'treasonably fabricating and making false money within the kingdom' under the paid of a fine of 1,000 marks and the obligation not being kept, the fine was levied.[87] However, on 14 June 1452 James II granted bishop Kennedy of St.Andrews the privilege of striking coins, probably part of the king's attempt to repay the bishop for his political

---

84. APS, ii, 43.

85. APS, ii, 172.

86. APS, ii, 182.

87. Pitcairn, Criminal Trials, i, 76. On 23 July Symonton and Inglis were granted a respite of three months in order to organize payment of the fine levied.

and financial aid during the Douglas cirsis of the early 1450s.[88] However, the coins minted at the instigation of the bishop would probably have been of small denomination with a very localized circulation.

Currency depreciation was a feature of Mediaeval Europe from the thirteenth century but its extent and timing varied considerably from one country to another. The highly developed economy of thirteenth century Italy was accompanied by a downward trend in the purity of the coin and, although the movement was temporarily arrested with the reduction in the demand for money following the decimation of the Black Death, heavy debasement returned in the fifteenth century. However, in north west Europe a more backward economy continued to operate until the beginning of the fourteenth century and there is little evidence of debasement before that time.

However, from the end of the wars of independance there was a gradual growth in demand for money in Scotland with the steady monetization of the economy. In the few sheriffs' accounts which have survived for the thirteenth century it is noticeable that most of the royal farms were submitted to royal fiscal officers in kind but during the succeeding two centuries cash payments became the principal mode of payment, although rent in grain and livestock still continued to form a substantial part of the royal income. Little is known of estate management in Scotland in the thirteenth century but in an age of growing population the tendancy seems to have been towards an expansion of the acreage under cultivation and the direct exploitation of the demesne. In Scotland, subtenants were required to pay their superiors heavy rents in kind and were bound to perform a series of services and obligations. However, with the decline in the level of the population in the fourteenth century the bottom fell out of the market for grain and many landowners, including the crown, were

---

88. RMS, ii, 1444. APS, ii, 73-4.

compelled to lease their property for cash rents. Although rentals including both cash and kind payments continued in the fifteenth century, during the reigns of James III and especially James IV the latter tended to lose ground to the former. With the advent of longer leases and feuing towards the end of the Middle Ages money payments largely superceded grain farms and the variety of feudal services, stimulated by the crown's need for ready cash to pay for increased household expenditure, shipping, building, artillery and a host of other items purchased both home and abroad. Invariably a middle man of fairly substantial means was placed between the crown and the various small tenants, paying a fixed cash 'reddendo' for his investment. For instance, in the reign of James III the stead of Tynnes in Ettrick Forest was let for a 'reddendo' of £6 in cash along with 1 'bow cow', 2 'fog and fule' marts and 20 lambs but on 26 October 1512 the same lands were feued to Alexander, lord Hume for a total farm of £50.[89] Similarly, when the lordships of Orkney and Shetland became royal property during the reign of James III the previous kind returns of 50 chalders of barley and 120 salted marts were wold locally by the leasee, Andrew, bishop of Orkney and the entire gross farm, calculated at £366-13-4, was levied in cash.[90] The tendancy of European landlords towards leasing their property for cash returns was a feature of the late Mediaeval period, even in the backward economy of Hungary, and represent just one example of the steady monetization of the economies of most western European countries.[91]

Connected with the above, there was, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a dramatic growth of government expenditure in late Mediaeval Europe. In Soctland this phenomenon was seen to occur especially. during the reigns of James I and IV. The scale of James IV's expenditure

---

89. ER, ix, 34. RMS, ii, 3775.

90. ER, ix, 28.

91. Pach, 'The development of Feudal Rent in Hungary in the Fifteenth Century'. E.C.H.R, 2nd series, xix.

on shipping, public works, artillery and military expenditions, large fees to foreign craftsmen, science and various other expenses connected with the augmentation in the size and ostentation of the royal household was indeed lavish. The Renaissance prince, to which status James IV undoubtedly attempted to aspire, required a large stock of ready cash to sustain the cost of various ventures and offset the purchase of numerous materials, most of which were obtained from foreign sources.[92]

The currency of most north western European countries suffered through the primitive nature of their credit systems. In the highly commercialized centres of the Low Countries and Italy bills of exchange and other credit arrangements coupled with the employment of various types of partnerships like the 'commenda' were utilized to facilitate the accumulation of capital and avoid the physical transportation of coin.[93] However, the commercial arrangements which existed in fifteenth and sixteenth century Scotland were primitive in comparison and dependant on the physical transfer of specie. The situation was further exacerbated by the desequilibrium in the balance of payments between Scotland and its importers. The economic and commercial climate of the later Mediaeval period became increasingly unfavourable to the countries of northern Europe emerging into the full flow of the Renaissance. A decrease in native exports following the disruptive effect of the Black Death was accompanied by a corresponding increase in the importation of luxury items from Eastern Europe and beyond. Such a situation was evident in fifteenth century Scotland where there was a steady decline in the exportation of raw wool, the principal Scottish export of previous centuries, while, at the same time, the crown and various other classes of society were anxious to invest in many of the expensive items

---

92. For details, see the Chapter on the Treasurers Discharge.

93. For details, see Miskimin, The Economy of Early Renaissance Europe, especially the chapter on 'The tolls of trade; Mediterranean dominance', 117-123.

associated with Renaissance movement. From the Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer there is recorded a detailed insight into the Continental purchases of James IV, mainly from the Low Countries and France, and including light expensive cloths, velvets and silks, rigging and wood for the navy, drugs jewelry, cannon and also the hiring of foreign expertise. Although James IV's foreign purchases were performed through the agency of both Italians like Jerome Frescobaldi and native factors such as James Simpson and Robert Barton,[94] the physical exportation of gold and silver currency was employed as the principal mode of payment.

In countries like Scotland with primitive credit arrangements, there was great concern over the stock of silver. The universal shortage of silver in Mediaeval Europe highlighted the problem of the supply of precious metals. The output of thirteenth century European mines had halted drastically, partly through the limitation of mining technology and partly through the lack of new mines, creating a shortage of available silver to meet the new demands of increasingly monetized economies.[95]

The Scotland, as in many other European countries, considerable legislation was passed in order to attract the importation of silver into the realm and conversely to discourage its exportation. During the fifteenth century, the Scottish crown was anxious, almost to the point of desperation, to preserve its meagre stock of silver. In the reign of James I a custom of 3/4 in the pound was placed on exported bullion and later in the same reign, a ban on the shipment of gold, silver (both coined and uncoined) or jewels was imposed under pain of escheat.[96] In 1466 no person, lay or spiritual, was permitted to send money out of the realm

---

94. TA, ii, 241-2, iii, 277-9, iv, 41, 294-5, 299, 300-7.

95. Miskimin, The Economy of Early Renaissance Europe, 112-5.

96. APS, ii, 37.

under pain of a £10 fine and the escheat of the money involved in the crime.[97] Efforts were made to enforce these statutes, in 1449-50, searchers were to be located at the major ports and on the marches in order to halt the export of bullion.[98] Repeated re-enactment of this stature stressed the necessity for the stringent application of the regulations concerning the preservation of bullion, and, as if to provide a greater incentive, in 1487, official searchers were to be rewarded with 33% of the ensuing escheate and outside informants were to receive 50%, the king retaining the remainder.[99]

However, the Scottish crown, in common with many of its European counter parts, was eager to curb the vast exportation of bullion for the purchase of benefices, the reversal of appointments already made and general litigation at the court of Rome. Statutes against the practice of barratry were first issued in 1363 [100] and became common entries in the Parliamentary records of the fifteenth century. In the Parliament of 1427-8 a statute was passed to ensure that clerks travelling abroad 'da no baratry' and also against extensive expenditure in the furtherance of a claim at Rome.[101] In 1471 Parliament declared that abbeys and benefices 'that were not of old at Rome' were not to be purchased by any secular or spiritual person, but that they were to have free election and in 1484 control was to be exercised over legitimate pleas to Rome since litigants were required, before their departure, to appear before the Exchequer to reveal the financial arrangements of the transaction in order to establish some sort of control over the amount of money leaving the country.[102] Various other

---

97. APS, ii, 86. Those leaving Scotland were only permitted one English noble 'for moderate expenses' unless on crown business.

98. APS, ii, 5.

99. APS, ii, 183.

100. APS, i, 492. In England, the statutes of Provisors (1350-1) and of Praemurire (1392-3) attampted to counter the same trend.

101. APS, ii, 16.

102. APS, ii, 99, 166.

statutes served to confirm the intention of the crown.[103] Penalties for the contravention of acts passed against barratry were harsh, in 1462, the forfeiture of the benefice involved in the arrangemtn was advocated while in 1485 it was suggested that those convicted of barratry were to suffer a similar fate as those found guilty of treason.[104]

Not unnaturally, the crown found it extremely difficult to enforce these statutes, a fact which was obvious by the constant need to reiterate them in Parliament. However, several cases of barratry were recorded in the judicial records. On 28 October 1497 Master George Hepburn was summoned before the Lords of the Council at the instance of the crown to answer 'upone the impertracione of the sade denery (Dunkeld) in the Court of Rome incontrar our soverance Lordis inhibicione... that nane of his legis suld pas nor send to the Court of Rome for the purchesing of the sade denery without his speciale licence, sen it is ane benefice elective under the panys contenit in the actis of our soverane Lordis Parliament, quhilk are rebellione'.[105] The fact that several cases of barratry appeared before the counts is in itself proof of the neglect of the king's policy.[106] The Ledger of Andrew Haliburton, the conservator at Bruges, reveled the extent of coin exportation, both by churchmen and merchants. Mention is made of the transmission of small sums of money by George Hepburn, charged with barratry in October 1497, to Rome.[107] The purchasing of bulls at Rome often proved an expensive business and resulted in exportation of large quantities of coin. Between May 1497 and December 1498 a total of £2,200 in Flemish groats calculated at three times the Scottish pound was paid through the bank of Cornelius Altanite in Bruges by the duke of Ross

---

103. APS, ii, 83, 171, 209, 232, 237.

104. APS, ii, 83, 171.

105. ADC, ii, 82.

106. ADC, ii, 90, 98, 108, 130, 196, 289.

107. The Ledger of Andrew Haliburton, 139, 254.

for papel confirmation to the archbishopric of St.Andrews and the associate benefices.[108] In fact, from the evidence available from the Ledger, it would appear that between 1492 and 1503 much of the Scottish communication with Rome, in the form of dispensations, litigation and other business, was financed through this bank.[109] In 1500 the conservator was bound to Altanite, the Roman banker, for 60 ducats owed by Dean William Crawford 'with the rachans (exchange) to be paid in Rom'.[110] Also, many Scottish merchants, whose business in Bruges was handled by Andrew Haliburton, submitted substantial quantities of cash as well as exports to pay for the constant flow of luxury items imported into Scotland during the reign of James IV. As well as a sack of Aberdeen wool, in October 1498, the conservator received a considerable sum of money from a servant of merchant Alexander Simpson, including 23 gold lions, 7 Harry nobles, 3 Rose nobles and an old crown, 'the gold set to the heast price' fetched £15 in Flemish coin.[111] Importers of luxury items into Scotland were forced to supplement their cash resulting from the sale of their exports with hard cash in order to purchase luxury items. Despite the regulations controlling the export of coin from Scotland, the crown itself, in search of large quantities of foreign imports, was probably the principal offender in this context, for the treasurer expended a substantial proportion of his cash receipts on such items. With an adverse balance of commercial payments, mainly through the dramatic increase in luxury consumption during the later Middle Ages, the economic climate demanded the constant export of bullion from countries like Scotland irrespective of contradictory legislation. Legislation was unable to halt the movement of the prevailing economic climate.

---

108. The Ledger of Andrew Haliburton, 214-8.

109. Ibid. 215, 234, 247-8, 257, 267, 271.

110. Ibid. 253.

111. Ibid. 143.

Conversely, the crown also attempted to compel the mercantile community to import large quantities of bullion but the commercial position of Scotland in the fifteenth century hardly made that demand a realistic proposition. Exporters were bound to bring home stocks of bullion proportinal to the amount of goods exported, for instance, in 1485 Parliament issued a tible for such a measure whereby 2 ounces of silver were demanded for every last of herring exported, 4 ounces for every serplathe of wool, last of salmon and 400 cloths and 6 ounces for every last of hides.[112] In return for the bullion supplied by Scottish exporters the warden of the mint was required to recompense the merchant to the tune of 9/2 per ounce in 1466, rising to 12/- by 1475,[113] an indication of the rising cost of silver. The custumar at each port of export to receive security for the importation of bullion by the exporting community and were to account annually at the Exchequer for the quantity received. Those failing to comply with the regulations were to be deprived of office and uncooperative merchants were to be fined £10.[114] In order to increase the flow of bullion into Scotland, the ratio associated with exported goods was stepped up during the reign of James III, for every last of hides, 2 ounces of silver was demanded in 1466, 4 ounces in 1474 and finally 6 ounces in 1485.[115] Despite stringent penalty clauses, there is no evidence that quantities of bullion were introduced into Scotland in this manner. No custumars accounted at the Exchequere for bullion received from the mercantile community under the terms of the Partilamentary statutes. Also the persistent repetition of the measure in the Parliamentary rolls betrays its ineffectiveness.[116] Since many other countries were adopting similar measures, it is difficult to see Scotland deriving any success from such measures. Measures were also taken

---

112. APS, ii, 213.

113. APS, ii, 86, 112.

114. APS, ii, 106.

115. APS, ii, 86, 106, 213.

116. APS, ii, 23, 37, 86, 90, 105, 106, 112, 166, 172, 182, 208, 212, 221, 250.

against the loss of gold and silver through the melting of bullion without royal licence and through dishonest goldsmiths, whose work was to be supervised by deacons and searchers.[117]

In the later Middle Ages, the universal shortage of silver was probably the underlying motive behind the continuous debasement. During the fifteenth century, the price of precious metals rose dramatically. A futher reflection of debasement. In a 'note of the prysses of the Cunyie in the haill tyme of James I to Queene Marey' the cost of an ounce of silver was stated to be 5/- Scots in 1437, 10/8 by 1460, 12/- by 1475, and 19/9 by 1514 and similarly the price of an ounce of gold rose from £3 in 1437 to £5-12/- in 1460 and finally to £12 in 1514.[118] In these circumstances, the Scottish crown, in common with other European monarchises, was forced to use various expedients to counter this lack of silver. Under David II the first attempt at a gold currency was issued, a nobel of 120 grains and worth 6/8.[119] In the fourteenth century, many other Continental nations experimented with this new type of coin, designed to ease the pressure on silver but which never reached a par with silver. For instance, from the surviving mint accounts between 1458 and 1476 a total of 1,310 lbs. of silver were employed in the minting of currency while only 34 lbs. of gold were used during the same period.[120] During the reign of Robert III there was a debasement of the gold currency, the lion was minted at 61 grains and valued at £3- but towards the end of the reign there was a reduction in the weight of the gold lion to 38 grains.[121] During the reign of James II the value of the lion was enhanced, to 6/8 in 1451 and then to 10/-.[122]

---

117. APS, ii, 166.172.
118. Cochran-Patrick, The Records of the Coinage of Scotland, i, LXXIV-LXXV.
119. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, 27.
120. See Appendix No. B/10(a)
121. Stewart, The Scottish Coinage, 137-8.
122. APS, ii, 39.

The crown was forced to coin more from the given weight of silver. The shortage of silver encouraged the king to seek alternative sources of precious metals, During the reign of James IV one of the main sources of silver for minting originated from the wealth of gold and silver plate, ornaments and jewels owned or purchased by the crown. Throughout the reign, Jamex IV was forced to mint portions of the great chain of gold.[123] In 1506 the treasurer was charged with £970-18/- as the seignorage from minting three old silver gilt jars, eight platters, six silver dishes and four salt cellars ('le sulsaris') into placks.[124] In that year large quantities of silver ornaments were melted into coin at a total profit to the crown of £1,537. In 1508 £42 was received by the treasurer from the minting of a chain which had been delivered to the king by lord Semple.[125] In 1512 £739 was charged to the treasurer from the minting of 44 lbs of silver vessel and a further £1,089 from converting 23 gold links of the king's great chain into coin.[126] In addition foreign coins, probably containing a greater element of silver that their Scots counterparts, were also melted down and minted to the profit of the crown. In 1506, for example, £377-1/- was acquired by the crown as profit from the converting of 3,696 French crowns into Scottish coins to the value of £2,587-4/-.[127]

During the reign of James IV, it is obvious from the accounts of the treasurer that the king derived considerable profit from this source of revenue. Even between 1497 and 1512 James IV was extracting more from a pound of coined silver or gold. In the former year, the treasurer was charged with £380 from minting 3 lbs, 5 ounces of gold into unicorns (that

---

123. TA, i, 314, iv, 172.

124. TA, iii, 31.

125. TA, iv, 13.

126. TA, iv, 172.

127. TA, iii, 31.

8s he derived £7-4/- from each troy ounce of gold) while by 1512 a receipt of £1,089 resulted from the minting of 7 lbs, 5 ounces of gold into the same coin but the profit per ounce of gold had risen to £9-6/-.[128] James IV profited greatly from the minting of debased coins. Between February 1496-7 and July 1498 the treasurer received a total of £757-13/- from minting new coins, in 1506 the profit amounted to £1,915-12/-, in 1508 £2,530, including almost £2,200 from the minting of 444 lbs of silver and £288 from 16 lbs. of gold, and finally, in 1512 a total of £7,621 was derived from the mint.[129] Compared with the mint accounts of the early fifteenth century, there is little doubt that during the reign of James IV, a greater amount of bullion was required to meet the increased demand for money but that each individual coin contained less gold and silver than in previous reigns.

The desparate need to discover fresh, and if possible native, supplies of silver and gold, encouraged James IV to invest in mining. It was by an act of 1424 that James I claimed possession of all mines in Scotland which could produce three halfpennies of silver from a pound of lead.[130] From 1511, and probably before, sir James Pettigrew, Sebald Northberg and Gerard Essemur received financial backing from the treasurer to work in the mine at Crawfordmure.[131] There is no indication of any strikes and it is likely that they only scratched the surface. It was only when James V leased such mines to foreigners in 1526 that extensive exploitation of native reserves of precious metals was undertaken.[132]

---

128. TA, i, 312-4, iv, 171-2.

129. TA, i, 313-4, iii, 31, iv, 12-3, 171-2.

130. APS, ii, 5.

131. TA, iv, 272-6, 396, 408, 422.

132. APS, ii, 310. The lease was of 43 years duration.

It woyld be fair to say that debasement in late Mediaeval Scotland was more a response to the appetitie of an impoverished government than any dramatic increase in the demand for currency within the economy. Debasement in Scotland stemmed from the crown and there can be little doubt that it received its impetus from the financial difficulties encountered by successive monarchs from David II. The need to provide sufficient cash to pay the ransom demanded for the return of David to Scotland in the mid fourteenth century set the ball rolling and the inadequacy of royal revenue to meet the costs of government during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries proved sufficient to maintain the process of currency depreciation. The issue of debased currency would have brought short term benefits to an impoverished crown for it temporarily offset the effect foreign debts and brought the crown considerable revenue from the new coin. The income derived from the minting of these coins considerably increased the purchasing power of the crown, providing the necessary additional revenue to absorbe government spending on buildings, shipping, artillery and the increased cost of the royal household. Despite the short term benefits of such actions, in the longer term, the result was damaging to both the crown and the commerce of the country.

There can be little doubt that debasment caused a great deal of commercial, economic and financial dislocation. There was a general feeling of uncertainty in almost all sections of Scottish society over the position of the native currency. The dramatic depreciation of the coinage during the later Middle ages, from the reign of David II to the late fifteenth century the number of pennies struct from a pound of silver rose from 252 to 1,680, succeeded in destroying confidence in the specie issued by the Scottish mint. Surviving evidence suggests that, despite the proliferation of native currency, the sections of society concerned with commercial transactions, including the crown, seem to have possessed a preference for the purer foreign currency while business conducted abroad

required stocks of alien coin as Continental merchants were equally sceptical of the Scottish issue. However, in a country where the development of a money economy was increasingly in evidence during the fifteenth century, a cheaper panny must have encouraged the flow of cash within classes which had hitherto not been in a position to utilise this medium. Because of the imbalance between the Scottish currency and those of the other countries with which Scottish merchants traded, the cost of materials from these sources was inflated. Probably the principal sufferer in this context was the crown, especially under James U and James IV, for both monarchs were actively engaged in the purchasing of both luxury and essential items from alien dealers, mainly based in Flanders and France. Although government costs in this department were already considerable, they were doubtless further augmented by the currency differences which foreign middle men were not slow to exploit. Despite the fact that debasement brought the crown short term benefits in the repayment of foreign advances or in an effort to raise sufficient cash to pay ransom, the long term disadvantages brought serious consequences.

Long term business transactions were seriously affected by the depreciation in the coinage, for the cash total quoted in the original agrement was gradually devalued according to the length of the deal. However, efforts were made in Parliament to counter the effects of this situation. Following the new issue of 1451, a statute related that wadsets made at the present monent were to 'be pit in the tyme of the quiting oute with swilk mone as was lent or allse the awail of it'.[133]

Long term commercial arrangements were at the mercy of the steady fall in the value of the Scottish currency, unless arrangement were made to ensure that the creditor received repayment according to the value of the coin at the time of the original transaction. The value of rents were also affected by currency fluctuations. In 1468 a complaint was recorded in

---

133. APS, ii, 41.

the Parliamentary records through diversities of payment by the acceptance of rent 'by the old payment' while disbursement was made at the 'dearer price' and also through the payment of rent 'by a high price' and giving it out again 'by the same price' although the 'pennyworths ar rysin with the penny and mekle derare than thai war wont to be that sulde the mone have generaly cours be the hie price that ilk man that suld ressave ony rentis war skathit the ferde or the fyft part of his rent quhilk war til hevy to thame in all estatis'.[134] It is likely that there was considerable speculation in currency alterations, especially immediately after the issue of a new, debased coinage. The temptation to engage in monetary speculation was undoubtedly increased by the co-existance in Scotland not only of both the old and the new, currency but also through the presence of many foreign currencies. Lack of confidence in the new issues culminating in the refusal to accept them in business transactions also provided the speculator with ready amunition. Even in a small country like Scotland, there seems to have been considerable variation in means of payment, as mentioned in the 1468 stature exacerbated by the fact that the new coins took longer to infiltrate the regions.

The relationship between debasement and the level of prices has provided historians of the sixteenth century with ample material for a lively controversy. The traditional theory of the sixteenth century price rise was related to the great debasement and enhancement of the currency during the first half of the sixteenth century and the influx of Spanish bullion from the Americas from the 1540s. However, certain facts have subsequently been brought to light to discredit this explanation. In the case of England, it would appear that the price rise was well underway before the great debasement of the years following 1542, even after that date prices do not seem to have risen in accordance with the decline in the

---

134. APS, ii, 92.

value of the currency and finally the rise in prices seems to have continued long after the debasement had ceased in the 1560s. It is, in fact, difficult to establish any firm connection between debasement and the price rise on account of the existance of a number of influencial variables, the distorting effect of bad harvests, the lack of uniformity in price increases, the fact that debased coins did not immediately supercede the old currency in use and the circulation of foreign coins. In short, it is extremely difficult to synchronise any parallel between debasemtn and the movement of prices.[135] Phelps Brown and Hopkins postulated that the price rise of the sixteenth century was the result of the increasing demands of a steadily rising population on the agricultural and industrial resources of the country, leading to a fluctuating but sustained rise in prices. The same rising population which created an increased demand for land holdings with the consequential inflation in rent levels also created an increasing pressure on the produce of that land.[136] The mounting demand of a steadily rising population and the result of a rise in landed rents pushed up the price of agricultrual products while a rise in wage levels and the increased cost of raw materials reacted on industrial prices.

The exact dating of the rise in prices has also produced a controversial subject. Thorold Rogers fixed the decisive upward swing from the 1540s [137] but Brenner argued that the price rise began much earlier, starting in the 1480s but gaining full momentum in the decade after 1510.[138] The price index figures produced by Phelps Brown and Hopkins

---

135. For details of the various arguments concerning the relationship between prices and debasement, see Outhwaite, Inflation in Tudor and Early Stuart England.

136. Phelps Brown and Hopkins, 'Wage-rates and Prices; Evidence for Population Pressures in the Sixteenth Century", Economica, xxiv, 289-306.

137. Rogers, A History of Agriculture and Prices in England, iv, 727-8.

138. Brenner, 'The Inflation of Prices in the Early Sixteenth Century', ECHR, 2nd series, xiv, 227.

suggests that the price of foodstuffs, taking the period 1451-75 as representing the unit of 100, remained relatively static from 1400 until around 1480, the decade following 1481 recorded an increase to 121, followed by a slight relapse to 100 and 106 in the next two decades, but from around 1510 the movement gained its full momentum with figures of 116, 159, 161 and 217 for successive decades up to 1550. Druing the follwoing fifty years the price indix rose dramatically, by 1600 it had reached 530 and by 1650 the level was quoted at 723. Concerning industrial produce , the level seems to have remined relatively static from 1440 until 1520 when the price level began to rise steadily although only at half the rate of the produce from the countryside.[139] These figures were produced for England but obviously the position varied according to the region under consideration. However, it has been maintained that the price revolution of the sixteenth century was preceded by a 'pre-revolution in prices'. Between 1450 and 1500 there was a slow rise in the price index, interrupted only by sharp cyclical movements. The fact that price levels in the Low Countries and England did not reveal any increase when measured in terms of silver was explained by the overvalutation of silver and the resulting devaluations had the effect ot temporarily hiding any evidence of a rise in prices.[140]

Despite the drastic shortage of evidence as regard price movements, it would appear that Scotland sufferred no significant price revolution in the period prior to the battle of Flodden in 1513. There is every reason to believe that the pressure of a rising population in Scotland during the first half of the sixteenth century was not as pronounced as in England, France or the Low Countries with the result that the price index was not

---

139. Phelps Brown and Hopkins, 'Wage-rates and Prices: Evidence for Population Pressure in the Sixteenth Century', Ecomonica, xxiv, 306.

140. Cambridge Economic History of Europe, iv, 401.

seriously affected during that period. In fact, it would appear that the price rise did not hit Scotland to any dgree until around the middle of the century and from 1550 until the death of James VI, the price of agricultural produce increased at least four times.[141]

Evidence concerning price levels in Mediaeval Scotland is extremely meagre and what figures that are available do not always reflect accurately the market value of a particular commodity. The heavy conservatism of commercial dealings in the late Mediaeval period in Scotland was reflected in the tendancy towards price fixing and control over the methods of sale which was prevalent in most of the leading burghs. Surviving burgh records registered the findings of assises held by burgh officials in order to fix the prices of commodities like wheat, ale, beer and malt. On 17 January 1491-2, 'the best quhett in the mercat wes fundin be ane assyse for xiis', presumably a boll. In subsequent entries, the price of a boll of wheat was fixed by the head court of the burgh of Edinburgh at 11/- in February 1495-6, 6/8 in April 1500, 13/- in October 1505 and 10/- in October 1506.[142] On 19 April 1492 it was stated that 'na maner of browster or dry topster within this burgh sell or tap ony aill derare than for viiid of xiid the galloun, under the payne of punitioun extreme'. The two prices were to be charged according to the quality of the ale and on 6 October 1506 the same price level was set by an assise.[143] In addition, the burgh council supervised both the quantity and quality of foodstuffs made and sold within the confines of the burgh. Also, the methods of sale were stringently regulated in a desire to avoid competition and to preserve the monopoly of control within the ruling class of merchant burgesses.

---

141. Lythe, The Economy of Scotland, 110

142. Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 61, 69, 79, 107, 110.

143. Ibid, 62, 111.

Forestalling and regrating, which involved the purchase of goods at favourable terms and storing them until a period of shortage, when the commodities would be resold at a considerable profit, were persistantly legislated against both by individual burgh councils and by Parliament. On 1 June 1439 a statute was issued from the tollbooth of Edinburgh that 'for commoun proffitt that quhasa brings victuale to Leyth sall be welcum to sell thair victuale as thai best may and house it gif thai list, but the sercheour sall se quhat guids of victuall cumis in the heaven, and quha dressis thema to bye that victuall sall sweir that thai sall nocht bye mair than may suffice to the dispenssis of thair household, and that thairof thai sall nocht sall agane for wynning'.[144] On 24 February 1495-6 a number of persons were convicted of purchasing French flour and 'selling and regraiting of it agane upoun the nychtbouris and the Kingis liegis'.[145] In the 1436 account of sir John Forrester, great chamberlain, a total of £342-9/- was received by that official during the year from forestallers in various burghs.[146] Although these attempts at price fixing and avoiding speculation on the price of essential foodstuffs were, none the less, affected by the vicissitudes of the market price of such commodities, there was a considerable artifical element in their settlement, encouraged by the desire to avoid the worst effects of dearth on price levels.

The judicial records provided considerable evidence concerning prices especially in cases of spuilze and the illegal occupation of property. However, any attampt at an index of prices from these documents is rendered virtually useless by the existance of a number of variables, the fact that prices tended to vary from one region to another, as did the units of

---

144. Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 6.

145. Ibid, 69. Such a crime was often accompanied by the sentence of banishment.

146. ER, iv, 669-70.

measurements, the fact that these price assessments were often calculated years after the commodity involved had been actuall spulized or otherwise appropriated and the tendancy for outside interference to affect the reckoning of prices. Invariably the pursuer elevated the price of the item in order to achieve the maximum profit from his loss. For instance, in an action between Janet and Owchtre McDowell on the one hand and John McDowell on the other over the spuilzie of certain goods, the former sued for the restoration of 160 balls of oats at 4/- a boll but the Lords of the Council decreed that the defender was to restore the 160 bolls of oats but the price of each boll was fixed at only 2/-.[147]

Perhaps the most reliable guide as to the movement of prices in Mediaeval Scotland is provided by the list of purchases and sales undertaken by royal officials. Throughout the year the comptroller or other members of the king's household were required to make the purchase of grain and livestock to supplement the provisions sent from royal property for the consumption of the king's household. Provisions from crown property, where royal tenants submitted part of their rents in kind, were either transported to the location of the king's household or, since it was custumary for a Mediaeval monarch to travel throughout his domain, sections of the kind returns were consumed by the king during his visitations to that particular locality. However, although a substantial proportion of the kind farms from the royal demesne were destined for the household, it was by no means uncommon for the comptroller or the local accountant to sell a portion of the rent in grain or livestock either to himself or a third party.

Despite the fact that household and property accounts tended to provide the historian with the best available guide as to the movement of prices in late Mediaeval Scotland, nevertheless, it would be true to say that these sources possessed their own defects. For instance, even when

---

147. ADC, ii, 468.

the actual price is stated in the account, and especially when an average price has to be calculated from the total cost, the level arrived at probably resulted from the combination of different grades of the same commodity. In addition, cognizance must be taken of regional variations in prices, different local weights and measures and the varying regional market conditions. But, more seriously, although many of the prices recorded in these accounts did in fact reflect the prevailing market trends, there were many instances of recorded prices being affected by the demands of the accounting system and the activities of accountants. In 1507 the 'Rentale Dunkeldense' stated that barley was transferred between officials at 6/8 a boll instead of the market price of 9/- a boll 'because for the needs of the household and workmen'.[148]

Although, on many occasions, the sale of agricultural produce from crown property did actually reflect the market trend in prices during the time of sale, there were several instances in the account of the Ballivi ad Extra of fictitious or aritificial sales. Concerning the former type of transaction, in 1471 2 chalders, 10 bolls of meal from the kind farm of the grange of Spot in Galloway were sold to John Morrison by the comptroller, Devid Guthrie and a further 9 chalders, 8 bolls from Galloway were sold to sir John Carlyle.[149] The cash receipts from sales by the local accountant were transmitted to the comptroller. In 1481, James Shaw of Sauchie, chamberlain of Stirlingshire sold 4 chalders of oats for £12-16/-, which cash was delivered to the comptroller who was then responsible in his own account for the payment.[150] However, in contrast, certain sales which were recorded in the accounts did not seem to represent a commercial transaction but served only to further demonstrate the artificial and conservative nature of the accounting system. In 1506 the lands of

---

148. Rentale Dunkeldense, 93, 201.

149. ER, vii, 90.

150. ER, viii, 96.

Murdochcairny were leased to Thomas Inglis, Walter Oliphant and David Swan for an annual rent of £20 in cash, 1 chalder, 4 bolls of wheat and 1 chalder, 8 bolls of barley but subsequently the king permitted the kind farm to be commuted for the payment of a further 10 marks for the wheat and £6 for the barley for the duration of the lease. Since this alteration in the lease farm was not recorded in the charge of the chamberlain of Fife, the discharge entry assumed the form of a sale.[151] Whether the 'sales' represented the market trend in prices or were fixed annually by charter or some other arrangement, they tended to reflect the movement towards the payment of rent in cash rather than kind. Frequently the 'sales' merely represented a form of commutation whereby the tenant, unable to submit his rent in land through poverty or shortage of grain, settled with the local accountant, to submit an equivalent cash return instead. Thus many 'sales' recorded in Mediaeval Scottish accounts merely represented an administrative convenience to hide a temporary or permanent alteration in the means of rent submission. From the 1470s the leasee of the lordships of Orkney and Shetland was bound to submit £366-13-4 annually in cash and, although it was stated that part of this total was achieved through the commutation of 50 chalders of barley and 120 salted marts at a fixed price.[152] Sucha an arrangement can only be ascribed to the conservatism of the financial system. Commutation of kind rents was frequently occasioned by the poverty of tenants. In 1461 the tenants of Murdochcairny in Fife were required to pay a new rent of 20 marks instead of £9 in cash, and 2 chalders, 4 bolls of wheat and 2 chalders, 13 bolls of beer on account of the poverty of the tenants.[153] Concerning such fictitious sales, it seems likely that the Ballivi ad Extra frequently extracted cash instead of grain or livestock from tenants despite the official farm recorded in his charge.

---

151. ER, xii, 444-6.

152. ER, ix, 184.

153. ER, vii, 104.

In 1501 the chamberlain of Galloway sought an allowance for a quantity of meal from the granges of Baldoon and Spot and the mill of Senwick for which he was charged 'because the said meal is sold in the rental for money to be paid at the feasts of Whitsun and Martinmas yearly'.[154] Such accounting manipulations might not reflect the actual movement of prices but merely a financial arrangement. However, where the 'selling price' of a commodity was fixed by customs or special arrangement, the settlement was normally to the advantage of the tenant, especially when the price of agricultural produce began to rise.

However, in the majority of cases where kind farms were 'sold' the price recorded tended to represent the true market value of the commodity. Also, the arrears of a previous account were frequently 'sold' at the price level of that year. These entries have provided the most reliable source of price movements within certain areas in Mediaeval Scotland. One of the striking features of these figures is the considerable variation in price levels from one region to another, due principally to the employment of different measurements in the more outlying areas, the variation in the quality of the crop and other regional peculiarities. For instance, in 1477, the average price of a boll of wheat from the earldom of Fife amounted to 10/-, from Stirlingshire 8/- and from Moray 6/8.[155] Similarly, in 1504 the cost of a boll of barley varied from 10/- in Fife, to 8/4 in Moray, to 7/9 in Bute.[156] Over the fifty years from the mid fifteenth century, a review of the price levels resulting from these sales revealed that, on average, a boll of grain in Moray fetched less than the equivalent in the more central regions of Fife or Stirlingshire. However, even within a given area, the price of a particular commodity varied. In 1481

---

154. ER, xii, 337, 456.

155. ER, viii, 409, 430, 447.

156. ER, xii, 195, 225, 248.

8 chalders, 2 bolls of oatmeal from Galloway was sold at the rate of 5/- a boll while a further 7 chalders, 4 bolls fetched 6/8 a boll.[157] Where no price was recorded in the rolls, it is probable that the grain fetched a wide variety of prices.

From the figures recorded from the 'sale' of grain farms in certain portions of crown property, it would seem that, allowing for seasonal fluctuations, there was little abvious rise in the price of agricultural produce by the death of James IV. From the incidents of the sale of wheat farms from the king's property in the earldom of Moray, there was no apparent increase in prices, for, in the years 1462, 1465, 1466 and 1469, the average cost of a boll of wheat amounted to 9/-, 6/8, 6/8 and 6/2 respectively, while in the years 1507, 1509, 1512 and 1513 the price was 10/-, 8/-, 6/8 and 6/8.[158] The record of sales of wheat from other areas of royal property are extremely fragmentary but there is still little evidence of any movement in prices.[159] A similar trend was recorded in sale prices of oatmeal from Galloway. From the sale of barley from Stirlingshire between 1475 and 1510 there was no indication of any long term price variation, Between the former date and 1484 the average price of barley varied from 6/8 and 10/- a boll and between 1507 and 1510 the cost of barley had not altered.[160] However, the barley prices from Bute did reveal the only definite increase from the mid fifteenth century level of 3/4 to 5/- a boll to between 6/- and 9/- in the first years of the sixteenth century.[161]

---

157. ER, ix, 126.

158. See Appendix No. B/10(c)

159. See Appendix No. B/10(e)

160. ER, viii, 283, 330, 431, 506, 564, ix, 95, 252, xii, 544, xiii, 27, 164. 273.

161. See Appendix No. B/10(e)

Dearth and famine had a startling effect on the level of grain prices. In the first three years of the 1480s the price of foodstuffs seems to have risen in most regions in Scotland. In Stirlingshire the price of a boll of wheat rose to 16/- (in the 1470s the boll had fetched from between 8/- to 12/- the boll) and in Moray, where a boll of barley was sold on average for around 4/- in the 1470s, cost 8/- in 1478 and 7/- in 1481. Also, in Galloway, the price of a boll of meal varied from 6/- to 7/-, but in 1478 the price had risen to 10/- and 12/-, in 1479 it was 8/-, and, although in the following two years the price dropped to as low as 4/2 in 1482 the price of a boll of meal soared to between 16/- and £1.[162] Undoubtedly the period from 1478 to 1482 witnessed a series of bad harvests which seem to have affected individual regions at different times and with varying effect. Contemporary opinion tended to exaggerate the effect of such events and concluded the wrong reasons for their occurance. One account related that 'thar was ane gret hungyr and deid in Scotland for the boll of meill was for four punds, for thair was blak cunye in the realm, strikkin and ordinyt be King James the Thred, halfpennys, and three-penny pennies, innumerabil, of coppir. And thai yeid two yer, and mair. And also was gret wer betwix Soctland and Ingland and gret distructioun throw the weris was of corne and catell. And thai two thyngs causyt hungar and derth, and mony pur folk deit of hungar'.[163] Firstly, from the evidence provided from the accounts of the chamberlain of Galloway, the sale price of a boll of meal was exaggerated and although the war and black money could hardly have eased the tight situation, it was undoubtedly the lack of supply of grain which resulted in the hunger and temporary rise in prices. However, it is also noticeable that, during periods of temporarily inflated agricultural prices, the crown seems to willing, or perhaps forced, to commute many kind farms to cash so as to ease the hardship of dearth on royal tenants.

---

162. See Appendix No.B/10(c)(e)

163. Pinkerton, The History of Scotland, ii, 503.

Unfortunately, information concerning the price of industrial products is largely confined to the volumes of the Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer which covered only sixteen months of the reign of James III and a considerable portion of the following reign. The prices of manufactured articles contained several variables which served to distort andy accurate index of the movement of these prices. For instance, different qualities of the same commodity were purchased for the royal household; ordinary members of the royal household received garments made from poorer quality cloth than that used for the king's own clothes. At the time of his wedding, James IV, purchased 22 ells of cloth of gold for his gown at £28 and ell and a further $20\frac{3}{4}$ ells for another gown at £32 an ell whereas in 1504 $3\frac{1}{2}$ ells of cloth of gold was purchased in the treasurer's name to make up half the coat for John de Cos, one of the king's henchmen, at the cost of 50/- an ell.[164] Also, the addition of expensive dyes and other decorations served to augment the price of an article. In addition, variations in the terms of sale and the vicissitudes of the monetary exchange rate must also have affected the price of particular commodities.

The absence of home based industries in Scotland forced the crown and other private purchasers to seek a large portion of their supplies of finer cloths, silks, iron, navel equipment and a variety of luxury items from foreign sources. Undoubtedly these foreign purchases had a dramatic effect on the treasurers' expenditure, but the evidence suggests that during the reign of James IV the average price of these articles did not vary to any large extent.[165] However there is evidence that certain commodities, for which there was obviously considerable demand, did show a substantial price increase. For instance, in the early years of

---

164. TA, ii, 208, 309.

165. For details, see chapter on 'Treasurers Discharge'

James IV's reign, eastland boards fetched between £5 and £14 a 100, averaging about £10, while in the years before Flodden, the treasurer was recording payments of £18-10/- and £20 a hundred.[166] The figures recorded in entries in the discharge side of the treasurers' accounts covering foreign purchases of iron, copper, wood of various types, fine cloths, silks and velvets, drugs and other miscellaneous items in fact represented the total bill paid by the king. The overall bill was the culmination of various items, manely the cost of transportation, foreign customs, general expenses and the fee demanded by the supplier for the undertaking.

166. TA, i, CCLXXII, 238, 254, iv, 445, 480.

CONCLUSION

There are so many misleading features abour Mediaeval accounts that it is extremely difficult to arrive at any conculsion concerning the annual revenue of the Scottish crown. Unfourtunately, earlier attempts at this task represent little more than superficial assessments, based on a blind and uncritical acceptance of certain figures. During the reign of James IV, Pedro de Ayala, sent by the king of Spain to induce James IV with the prospect of a marriage contract with a Spanish princess to conclude a treaty with Henry VII of England, gave the following figures regarding the king's revenue from arable and pasture land at 40,000 ducats, from customs at 28,000 ducats, from fines and escheats at 25,000 ducats and from wardships at 20,000 ducats, making a total income of 113,000 ducats. The origin of his figures is unknown but there is little doubt that they are vastly exaggerated for, assuming the ducat was valued at around 16/- in Scotland at the time oa Ayala's visit, it would mean that the total income of the Scottish crown amounted to the ridiculous figure of £89,400.[1] More modern estimations of the income of the Scottish crown were at least calculated after consultation with the relevant accounts, but the figures produced only scratched the surface of the problem. George Burnett, in his preface to the ninth volume of the Exchequer Rolls, recorded an approximate estimate of the revenue of the crown during the reign of James III at £16,380.[2] This total was derived from the following returns, £10,600 from royal property; that is £7,500 from rents with the addition of one third (or one fifth in the case of Galloway) for the grassum and £3,100 for the cash value

---

1. Grant, The Social and Economic Development of Scotland before 1603, 207 From the entries in the first volume of the Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, it would appear that the ducat, a gold coin, was normally equivalent to 15/6 Scots but it was also exchanged for 16/- and 18/-.

2. ER, ix, LXXVI.

of rents in kind, £1,720 from the sheriffs' accounts, based on the total charge from the sole series of accounts for 1471, £3,300 from the customs and £760 from the burgh farms. However, the gross income of the crown, to which these figures refer, represented only the value of these sources of income to the crown but in no way expressed the real income extracted by the crown. To give an example, Burnett maintained that the gross revenue from the burgh farms amounted to £760 annually during the reign of James III but the real revenue extracted from this source, that is the amount of cash transmitted by the burgh baillies to the comptroller who dealt with a substantial proportion of the financial needs of the king and his household, averaged only around £150 annually. The gross income total, the figure which most Scottish historians have used when attempting to assess the revenue of the Scottish crown at a particular period, represented only the revenue for which the accountant was personally responsible. This gross figure was normally greatly in excess of the real revenue estracted by the crown and even substantially greater than the cash actually handled by the local royal official.

Many of these who have, in the past, referred to the financial accounts of the Scottish crown during the later Middle Ages have tended to accept the figures quoted in the Exchequer Rolls at their face value, ignoring the vast amount of paper work which made up a substantial proportion of these Mediaeval accounts and the distorting affect of the overall conservative tone which pervaded these fiscal records. It would be true to say that the majority of custumars, Ballivi ad Extra, sheriffs and burgh baillies actuall handled only a fraction of the revenue for which they were held responsible. Allowances sought by these local accountants represented not only the expenditure disbursed by the official himself but also the administrative method used by the accountant to absolve himself from the difference that existed between the revenue recorded in his charge, for which he was personally responsible, and the actual cash collected by

him. The gulf was composed of such items as the difference between the farm recorded in the accountant's charge and that in the king's rental, lands remaining in waste, royal property occupied by an unauthorized person, frequently a local landholder, customs which were uncollected either through the concession of a remission or through refusal on the part of the exporter to submit the levy, the illegal seizure of royal revenues, the hereditary and liferent grant of royal property and the assignation of farms from estates which were collected directly by the grantee. Allowances for such items were merely paper work designed to clear the accountant from responsibility for the collection of income which did not, in fact, exist, which had been irretrievably lost or which had been legally alienated by the crown. Because of the rigid nature of the charge side of many accounts such allowances represented a substantial proportion of the discharge, and so revealing the distorted impression created by the charge total. Taking for example the cash portion of the 1474 account of James Douglas, chamberlain of royal property within the sheriffdoms of Elgin and Forres, and the lordships of Glencairny and Abernethy, the gross income due from these estated was quoted at £414-19-10. However, out of this toal, £61 was deducted as certain lands were leased at a rate lower than that recorded in the charge, £3-10/- for territory still in waste and £16 were assigned annually to the keeper of Darnaway castle, in addition to which the chamberlain paid out £45-17-11 in pensions to ecclesiastical foundations and £22-18/- in local expenses and fees. Net receipts by Thomas Simpson, the receiver-general, totalled £224-6-8 out of a gross charge of almost £415. The rest from the account totalled £41-7-5 and it is probably that a large portion of that figure was composed of irretrievable arrears from which the crown derived little or no financial benefit.[3]

---

3. ER, viii, 218-221. This account recorded the financial transactions of James Douglas for a period of a single year and it inherited no arrears from the previous settlement.

However, the crown derived even less financial profit from other local accountants. In 1475, David Lutherdale, chamberlain of crown lands within the shire of Linlithgow, was responsible for a gross income totalling £167-3-7, of which only £43-11/- reached the receiver-general.[4] In fairness, it would be true to say that a large portion of the allowances sought by these local accountants did, in fact, represent genuine expenses undertaken by these officials on the crown's behalf, as well as the effect of royal patronage. For, concerning the above example, the difference between the gross charge and the real revenue was absorbed by grants of portions of royal demesne, assignations, fees, pensions and other payments to royal benefactors.

From the annual accounts of these local officials, it is possible to determine not only the gross charge, with all the misleading connotations but also the real revenue derived by the crown from these sources. Taking the cash returns from the accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra, the cushumars and the burgh baillies, the gross average annual charge for the following periods, 1457 to 1460, 1485 to 1488 and finally 1509 to 1513, representing the final years of the reigns of James II, III and IV, ranged from £9,317 to £11,358 to £15,339 respectively. In contrast, the cash transmitted by these officials to the comptroller, namely the real revenue amounted to an annual average of £3,505 at the close of the reign of James II, £5,192 in the 1480s and £9,050 during the years before Flodden.[5] The combination of periodic additions to the royal demesne and the effect of augmentations in crown rents resulted in a 60% increase in the gross charge from the final years of the 1450s to 1513 but it is significant that the real income total had risen threefold during the same period. This narrowing of the gap between the gross and real income of the crown from these local sources reflected not only a reduction in the burden of royal

---

4. ER, viii, 304-5.

5. ER, 292-664, ix, 298-557. x, 1-72, xiii, 128-585.

patronage and expenditure borne by local fiscal officials but also a substantial increase in the efficiency of these royal servants. The real figures from local accounts provided the most reliable guide as to the financial position of the crown. However, certain items of revenue have been omitted which would have swollen the returns listed above. Firstly, the income derived from the sheriffs has been excluded on account of the extremely low survival rate of the accounts and the fact that, during the reigns of James III and IV, a large proportion of these accounts comprised of mere paper work - most of the revenue derived from the profits of justice and feudal incidents were in fact collected directly by the treasurer. In the sheriffs accounts rendered in the year 1501, out of a total gross charge of £23,364, only just over £281 found its way into the coffers of the comptroller.[6] Secondly, it was not uncommon for grassums and entry fines to be submitted directly by the tenant to the comptroller without involving the Ballivi ad Extra. In 1486, for instance, the chamberlain of Moray was not charged with £53-6-8, the grassum due from certain property let to James Innes by Thomas Simpson, the comptroller, who received the cash straight from the lessee.[7] Thirdly, although the payment of rent in kind was an extremely important and complex feature of royal revenue an assessment of the cash value of these grain and livestock farms - calculated at £3,100 by Burnett for the reign of James III - would be an extremely difficult task in an era of constantly changing prices about which there is only limited information. Despite the introduction of longer leases and feuing with their emphasis on augmented cash 'reddendos', kind farms continued to be levied at a leval charged in the fifteenth century. In 1487 the total gross king income from royal property amounted to 138 chalders of wheat, 108 chalders of oats, 100 chalders of meal, 215 chalders of barley or bere and 386 marts of various types while in 1507 the totals

---

6. ER, xi, 301-382.

7. ER, ix, 361.

amounted to 138 chalders of wheat, 281 chalders or barley of bere, 139 chalders of oats, 74 chalders of meal and 419 marts. From the later gross charge, the amount of grain and livestock actually delivered to the royal household or to the king's bakers or brewers, converting into bread of bere, consisted of 104 chalders of wheat, 170 chalders of barley, 6 last of salmon, 56 chalders of oats and 130 marts while £760 in cash was also transmitted to the comptroller from the sale of kind farms.[8]

However, the most satisfactory assessment of the annual income of the Scottish crown was derived from the receipts of the comptroller and the treasurer who stood at the apex of financial administration and dealt with most of the principal items of royal expenditure. The income charged to these officials represented the real revenue paid by the various local officials and private individuals. Between them, these officials accounted for most of the fiscal rewards to be gained from the king's patrimony, the comptroller was in receipt of revenue from the royal demesne, the great customs, a portion of the sheriffs' returns, burgh farms and the sale of grain and livestock belonging to the crown whereas, the treasurer was responsible for the collection of the profits from the justice ayre, remissions settled outside the ayre, escheats, the chamberlain ayre, feudal casualties, of ward, relief, non-entry and marriage, administrative fees from the granting of royal charters, the profit from the mint and miscellaneous other receipts including the instalments of the king's dowry and returns from taxation. From 1424 until the accession of James IV, information concerning the annual receipts of these central officials is extremely scanty, the only satisfactory evidence came from two accounts, the account of comptroller, Alexander Napier of Merchiston from September 1449 to August 1450 in which a total of £5,405 was recorded in his charge and the account of treasurer, John, bishop of Glasgow, from August 1473 to December 1474 in which he was responsible for a sum of £3,241.[9]

---

8. ER, xii, 483-590.

9. ER, v, 390-6, TA, i, 1-12.

From 1488 until 1513 the accounts of the treasurere and comptroller are reasonably complete but any attempt to corrolate the income of these two officials in hampered by the fact that their accounts tended to be of varying durations. It is, therefore, necessary to work out an average annual receipt for a given period from the accounts available. Taking the periods 1491 to 1498, 1498 to 1506 and 1506 to 1513, the average annual income from the treasurer rose from £5,309 to £14,974 to £22,019 while the annual income from the accounts of the comptroller increased from £8,252 to £8,612 and finally to £12,311. It is noticeable that, at the outset of the reign of James IV, the comptroller was responsible for a larger proportion of the king's income than the treasurer and although his receipts rose to over £12,000 annually during the years before Flodden, the comptroller had been overhauled in fiscal importance by the treasurer. The increase in the receipts fo the comptroller during the early years of the sixteenth centruy was partly the result of greater efficiency on the part of local accountants but more especially, the effect of substantial augmentations in the level of rent demanded from royal property in response to the tendancy towards longer leases and feuing. The dramatic surge in the revenue charged to the treasurer was largely the result of the systematic introduction of the sale through the payment of a composition for remissions, escheats and feudal incidents and the vigorous exploitation of technical oversights by certain landholders through the employment of the casualties of non-entry and recognition. Thus, the annual income of the Scottish crown, as recorded in the various accounts of the comptroller and treasurer averaged £13,561 between 1491 and 1498, £23,786 between 1498 and 1506 and finally £34,330 for the final seven years of the reign of James IV.[10] However, the final accounts of both officials for the reign recorded a total income of £31,338-11-8 from the account of the treasurer for the year ending August 1512 and £13,245-8-7 for 1508-9, amounting to

---

10. See Appendix No. B/8(b), B/9(a)

a total income of £44,584. In order to avoid distortion, it was necessary to exclude the dowry which accompanied Margaret Tudor since the addition of an extra £35,000 over the three years from 1503 to 1505 would have artificially elevated the treasurers' receipts for those years and also the subsidies periodically accepted by the comptroller from the treasurer in order to reduce the size of the former's deficit. Although the treasurer's charge consisted of revenue actually collected by that official but there was no guarantee that the sums recorded in the comptroller's charge were in fact received. For instance, on 7 February 1497-8 on behalf of the late Alexander Leslie of Wardris, comptroller for most of the time during the decade 1475 to 1485, pursued an action before the Lords of the Council against James Douglas of Pittendreich, a former chamberlain of Moray, for the detention of £73-8-11 since Leslie 'tuke the sade soume apoun him in the rollis at the chekker haldin for the tyme for the sade James and be bound til haf payit the sammyn to the sade umquhile Alexander or his ayeris at termes bigane, like as his letters obligat ours made to the umquhile Alexander and his ayeris thareuppone proportis'.[11] Although the treasurer's charge was, on the whole, representative of his actual receipts there was, on the other hand, no equivalent guarantee that the income quoted in the comptroller's charge coincided with the cash collected by that official.

Although there was a dramatic growth in royal revenue handled by the comptroller and treasurer during the reign of James IV, there was an even greater increase in the overall cost of royal government in Scotland. The rapidly expanding royal household and the vast consumption of cash on military ventures, public works, shipping and the purchase of articles from foreign sources. The king's household bill during the reign of James IV, was not so much affected by a change in the price index as by the overall expansion not only in the numbers recruited into royal service but also in the extent of splendour, for James IV was determined to style his court on

---

11. ADC, ii, 102.

the Renaissance models of the Continent. However, Renaissance models proved to be extremely costly. Household expenditure for a single year between 1494 and 1496 amounted to £9,925, of which £7,103 for daily provisions, spices, chandlery, 'uncosts', wine, stable expenses and certain household fees was sustained by the comptroller and £2,822 for the cost of the royal wardrobe, fees, pensions and livery for household servants, was met by the treasurer.[12] By the end of James IV's reign, household expenditure had doubled to an annual bill of £21,404, of which the treasurer was responsible for £8,824 and the comptroller £12,579.[13] In addition to the cost of the royal household, the treasurer and comptroller were required to offset most of the other expenses of government, the justice ayre, the Exchequer, diplomacy, alms and offerings, not to mention the disbursement of expenditure on shipping, building, artillery, alchemy, luxury purchases from abroad, tournaments and the hiring of foreign craftsmen. Royal expenditure during the reign of James IV rose dramatically, for the year ending in the winter of 1496 the aggregate discharge of both the comptroller and the treasurer amounted to £11,200, of which the former contributed just over £7,100 and the latter around £4,100 but, in the early years of the second decade of the sixteenth century, annual expenditure had rocketed to £51,700, £13,000 of which was submitted by the comptroller and £38,700 by the treasurer.[14] Although expenditure was, to a certain extent, limited

---

12. The account of treasurer, George, abbot of Paisley, stretched from June 1494 to November 1495 and it was, therefore, necessary to reduce the total expenditure by a quarter in order to arrive at a figure for the period of twelve months. This was the only account in the 1490s which provided information concerning fees, pensions and livery given to household servants, for, in other accounts, these payments were included in the 'Bursa Regis' section. The comptroller's account stretched from December 1495 to the same month in 1496.

13. The final accounts of these officials for the reign of James IV were the 1509 account of comptroller, James Redheuch, and the 1512 account of treasurer, Andrew, bishop of Caithness.

14. TA, i, 223-271, iv, 174-358. The account of treasurer, George, abbot of Paisley stretched from June 1494 until January 1496-7 and it was necessary to divide the total expenditure of the account by $2\frac{1}{2}$ to arrive at an annual figure. Miscellany of Scottish History Society, ix, 65-8.

by the size of royal income, it is clear that the former frequently outstripped the latter. James IV's rate of spending was liberal to the point of being reckless with little attention being paid to the financial viability of many of the royal ventures. Many projects, the building of the Great Michael, the military and naval preparations in the years prior to Flodden and indeed the cost of the royal household, snowballed in cost well beyond the financial means of the crown. For instance, James spared no expense in the financing of his own wedding. In the 1503 account of comptroller, John Stirling of Craigbernard, expenditurefor the year totalled £11,412, of which £6,125 was expended on the provisioning of the wedding festivities from 7 August until 6 September 1503 while between September 1502 and February 1504-5 treasurer, David Beaton of Creich, spent a total of £55,836, a large portion of which was consumed in expensive clothing for the king and his retainers, luxury purchases from abroad and the cost of preparing the royal palaces for residence.[15] An outlay as great as this demanded the availability of revenue above the traditional income of the crown. In fact, the comptroller was subsidized to the tune of £1,806-4/- by the treasurer while the latter was able to avoid a huge deficit by laying hands on two thirds of the king's dowry which amounted to £23,333-6-8.[16]

From the meagre evidence available, it would appear that, during the reigns of James I, II and III, both the comptroller and the treasurer found great difficulty in coping with the demands of royal expenditure from the traditional sources of revenue. During these three reigns, the comptroller remained the principal fiscal officer and, faced with declining customs returns, static burgh feufarms and the haphazard and wasteful collection of the profits from feudal incidents and justice, a heavy reliance was placed on the crown's ability to increase the royal demesne as the principal means of augmenting his income. Frequent references to

---

15. This total excluded the transferance of £5,294 to the comptroller.

16. ER, xii, 180-2. TA, ii, 197-479.

deficits in the accounts of the comptroller and the various methods employed to repay these officials is an indication of the fact that the revenue collected by the comptroller was insufficient to meet the demands of the king's household.[17] In the 1450 account of Alexander Napier a loss of £1,315 was recorded.[18] At this time the treasurer seems to have occupied a more secondary role but, in similar vein, the account ending in December 1474 recorded a deficit of £1,179.[19] During the reign of James IV, it was the treasurer who controlled the lion's share of the king's revenue and although his revenue increased substantially in the period from Sauchieburn to Flodden, the principal feature of that period was the tremendous surge forward in royal spending. From the surviving accounts of the comptroller and the treasurer, it would appear that the accumulation of a large deficit was the usual ending to these accounts. Concerning the treasurers' accounts, the term of office of George Shaw, abbot of Paisley from June 1494 to January 1496-7 ended with imbalance of £3,252, James, abbot of Dunfermline, treasurer from February 1504-5 to August 1508 amassed a deficit of £2,446, from August 1511 to the same month a year later Andrew, bishop of Caithness recorded a loss of £7,432 while in the ten months prior to August 1513 Cuthbert Baillie was out of pocket to the tune of almost £2,000. However, some officials did record a profit. Between February 1500-1 and September 1502, David Beaton of Creich achieved a surplus of £3,427. The situation might have been worse but for two large windfalls of cash to the treasurer, from 1488 the accounts of lord St.John were bolstered by the discovery of James III's treasure amounting to over £24,500 and the income for the years 1503, 1504 and 1505 was artificially boosted with the addition of the king's dowry totalling £35,000.[20] Although the comptroller's

---

17. See the chapter on the Comptrollers' Accounts.

18. ER, v, 397.

19. TA, i, 75.

20. See Appendix No. B/9(a)

accounts did not display such large deficits this was due, on many occasions, to the transferance of substantial sums of money from the treasurer to that official. Between 1488 and 1490 £3,300 passed to the comptroller in this way and between 1502 and 1508 a total of no less than £23,828 was involved.[21] In 1492 Hugh Martin recorded a deficit of £843 and by September 1508 James Redheuch had overexpended to the tune of £136 but, on the other hand, between December 1495 and May 1498 sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch transformed a loss of £3,594 into a small profit of £5.[22]

It is probable that historians have tended to overestimate the importance of the spending of James IV in comparison with earlier kings. Undoubtedly this has stemmed from the fact that the reign of James IV has provided the historian with a much fuller account of his fiscal activities than has survived for the reign of James I, II or III. However, there is evidence that James I spent considerable sums of money on artillery and the purchase of luxury items from abroad, for which the tax levied for his ransom and the customs returns provided the principal means of payment, and was also engaged in the rebuilding of Linlithgow Palace, that James II purchased Mons Meg, and sustained the cost of several military expeditions, that Mary of Guelders invested royal income in the construction of Revenscraig castle and Trinity College and that James III used royal revenue to provide military and naval equipment. Unfortunately, the lack of a consistant series of accounts of either the comptroller or the treasurer make it impossible to assess the exact extent of royal spending prior to 1488. In addition, both James II and III were faced with serious rebellions during their reigns, which, although giving a fillip to the purchase and servicing of military engines, were, nonetheless, a heavy drain on royal revenue both through rewards and financial support to loyal

---

21. See Appendix No. B/8(b)

22. See Appendix No. B/8(h)

adherents and also through the loss of income through plundering and wastage by rebels. Also long minorities, as experienced at the outset of the reigns of James II and III, were serious setbacks to the financial strength of the crown. During the minority of James II large sums of royal income were diverted into the pockets of William, lord Crichton and the Livingstones while many local accountants were forced to overlook the persistant plundering of crown funds by powerful landlords. In addition, the Boyds took advantage of the minority of James III by abducting the monarch when on his way from the Exchequer in Edinburgh to Linlithgow and forcing on the unwilling monarch the marriage of Thomas Boyd, son of Robert, lord Boyd and the king's sister, Mary with the accompanying alienation of the royal property of Stewarton, Turnberry in Carrick, Great Cumbrae, the island of Arran, Terrenzeane and Risedalemure in the bailliery of Cunningham.[23]

During a substantial part of the fifteenth century, there can be little doubt that the extent of royal spending was effectively curbed by the limitations of royal income. However, the evidence revealed that James IV was not burdened with the same restrictions. Although the reign of James IV has benefitted from the existance of more documented evidence there is little doubt that royal property, crown justice, feudal casualties and legal technicalities were exploited to the full by dedicated civil servants in order to augment the king's income. However, he was greatly assisted by the lack of a damaging minority, as experienced by James II and III, and an extensive period of political stability. It would also be true to say that excessive largess, extravagent project, ill conceived and expensive military expeditions and an expensive Renaissance styled court absorbed revenue beyond the means of the crown. Although many historians, both past and present, have regarded James IV's reign as both spectacular and forward looking, Buchanan put it in truer perspective when he maintained, in his description of the character of James IV, that

---

23. APS, ii, 185. RMS, ii, 912, 914

'among these virtues, some vices obtruded, which arose from his too great desire for popularity; for while he endeavoured to avoid the reproach of avarice, incurred by his father, and to attract the affection of the common people by sumptuous buildings, by the exhibition of tournaments and spectacles, and by immoderate gifts, he reduced himself to such poverty, that if he had lived longer he might have extinguished the affection of former times by the hatred he would have excited by new taxes, so that perhaps upon the whole, his death may be thought to have been for himself rather fortunate, than premature.[24]

Although from the return of James I from England in 1424, till 1513 and especially during the reign of James IV, the king's patrimony was systematically, though not always efficiently, exploited for its fiscal contribution towards the expenses of government, royal patronage still remained a large consumer of crown revenue. The dispersion of patronage assumed various forms, the hereditary and life concession of property, the assignation of revenue from a particular source, the payment of a specific fee, the grant of a lease or feu at a reduced rent or the gift of feudal casualties and escheats. In these cases the result was a heavy drain on the potential income of the crown. On the other hand, the distribution of grants and gifts was the most effective method of attracting and maintaining the political support of the most powerful persons in the country and of attracting the services of men to the various aspects of royal government. The most damaging type of concession involved the hereditary transferance of property of the hereditary pension from the great customs. The proliferation of these modes of royal patronage in the fourteenth and early fifteenth century severely curtailed the amount of revenue flowing into the royal coffers but the arrival of James I in 1424 brought the majority of these hereditary concessions to a sudden end. The use of the profit from royal property and the great customs for the purposes of patronage did not cease but there was a shift in emphasis as the damaging hereditary grant was largely replaced by concessions limited for a term of years or, at the most, for the lifetime of the grantee. During the fifteenth and

---

24. Buchanan, History of Scotland, Ed. Aikman, ii, 261-2

early sixteenth centuries, the accounts of burgh baillies, Ballivi ad Extra and custumars recorded a series of liferent grants, peneions, fees and assignations which rarely contined after the death of the benefactor. Even this diluted form a patronage was, nonetheless, a considerable drain on the fiscal resources of the crown. The effect of patronage on royal income from crown property whithin the sheriffdom of Linlithgow was considerable for, in 1508 out of a gross cash charge of £182, £142 was deducted in various grants and concessions. For instance, sir John Sinclair retained a liferent grant of the demesne land, mill and cottages of Houston, at an annual farm of £35-16/-, sir Patrick Hamilton was assigned 40 marks annually from the farms of Linlithgowshire for the keeping of Blackness castle and sir Alexander McCulloch of Mireton, £10 for the custody of Linlithgow palace, while Thomas Shaw, the cook was in receipt of a fee of £10-8/- from the farm of Drumcors.[25] However, the permanent or hereditary alienation of royal property was not totally suppressed. The scope of these hereditary concessions was effectively limited by the desire, on the part of the crown, to employ the royal demesne as an important contributer to the cost of government. The hereditary grant of an estate to the king's nearest relatives was an unavoidable drain on the royal demesne and this policy was followed in all wester mediaeval states. Special royal favourites were occasionally rewarded in this manner, during the reign of James III, substantial tracts of property within the earldom of March was conceded in hereitage to various member of the Hume king, Alexander Kirpatrick Alexander Bruce and David, earl of Crawford, probably in return for assistance during the crisis years 1479-83,[26] while, in the following reign Alexander Elphinstone, created lord Elphinstone in January 1509-10, and a kinsman of William Elphinstone, keeper of the privy seal and one of the

---

25. ER, xiii, 61-3.

26. ER, ix, 518-20.

principal advisors of James IV, was granted a hereditary concession of the entire lordship of Strathdon.[27] In addition, grants in mortmain to ecclesiastical bodies also represented a perpetual drain of royal resources. From 1488 the lands of Kirkhill in Linlithgowshire were mortified to the college at Restalrig while on November 1506, the newly founded royal chapel inside Stirling castle was granted in mortmain the royal property of Castle-Law near Edinburgh and the lands of Strathbran, Glenshee and Auchinvaid in Perthside, which formerly contributed a gross annual farm of £184-13-4 to the crown.[28]

So great was the scope of fees submitted to household servants and other royal officials that cash for this purpose came not only from the accounts of the comptroller an treasurer but also from the local accounts of the custumar, Ballivi ad Extra and burgh baillie. Until 1513, the wardens of the marches and keepers of royal castles derived their entire fee from local sources and although many household servants were also still paid in this manner, the prevailing trend was for greater centralization of payment with the reposnsibility for the fees and pensions of most of these officials resting with either the comptroller of the treasurer. Around 1500, the aggregate cash total expended by the comptroller and treasurer on fees and pensions amounted to between £1,600 and £1,800 annually but a decade later this total had risen to over £4,400, due partly to the augmentation in the number of officials employed by the crown and partly to the fact that many fees, formerly paid by local accountants, were now the responsibility of central officials.[29] However, appointment of royal servants to ecclesiastical benefices was a convenient and cheap method of bestowing royal patronage, which must have brought considerable relief to royal finances. In fact, many pensions were terminable on promotion to a benefice of a stipulated value. For instance, on 5 September 1511 Henry Mair was granted a pension of £20 annually from the customs of Edinburgh for life or until his promotion to a benefice valued at £40 annually.[30] Concerning other royal

---

27. ER, xiii, 69-72, 300-4.
28. ER, x, 332. RMS, ii, 3002.
29. See Appendix No.B/8(c), B/9(b)
30. RSS, i, 2302.

employees, most fiscal officers extracted their fee from the revenue collected within their jurisdiction, temporary appointments such as those assigned to the justice ayre were in receipt of a daily fee and expenses for the duration of the commission while prominant officials like the chancellor and the keeper of the privy seal were entitled to a small fee from every letter of charter which emanated from their office. Although the evidence is extremely meagre, it is likely that many royal officials supplemented their official fees with bribes and gifts handed over by suitors in return for favoured treatment. The actual extent and the profit to be made from corruption in official circles is difficult to assess but there are frequent cases of the perversion of justice. Proceedings dealing the partiality on the part of sheriffs and juries,[31] false charters,[32] two official letters relating to the disposition of the same portion of royal patrimony [33] and the appearance of defective brieves[34] suggested the prevalence of both inefficiency and corruption. However it is likely that the crown turned a blind eye to a large proportion of the irregular and dubious practices.

As in Rome, it would appear that payments by royal officials 'into his coffers' or 'into his purse' refers to the existance of a private royal treasury outwith the direct control of either the comptroller or treasurer. It is clear that James I received large sums of money from the great customs in this manner. In 1425 the customars of Edinburgh submitted £321-3-8 'to the lord king for his own use as shown in a document written in the hand of his secretary' and in 1434 Thomas Cranstone, receiver-general south of the Forth, paid a total of £367-5-9 directly to the coffers of the king and queen through the receipt of Robert Nory.[35] There is evidence that James I contributed to his various building programmes from this private source, for, in 1434, Robert Gray, master of works at Edinburgh castle

---

31. ADC, ii, 371, 400.

32. ADC, ii, 373, 449, 501.

33. ADC, ii, 115, 284-5.

34. ADC, ii, CIX, 218, 286.

35. ER, iv, 381-2, 602-3.

and Leith £140 in cash at various times from the king and a further £81 from the sale of wine belonging to the king.[36]

It would appear that, during the reign of James II, local accountants were still contributing to the king's private income. In 1448, the baillie of Carrick submitted £45 'into the king's coffers' as shown by royal letters of receipt issued under the signet produced at the Exchequer while the clerk of the register made similar such receipts on the king's behalf around 1450.[37] It is probably in relation to this private stock of money that James III's reputation for parsimony is best exposed. Although James III's comptrollers were frequently in financial difficulties, it would appear that, by the end of his reign, the king's personal coffers were full of cash and jewels. Following the battle of Sauchieburn, on 17t June 1488, at the command of the newly installed James IV, the earls of Angus and Argyll, the bishop of Glasgow, lords Hailes and Hume and the treasurer 'past to the castell to see the jowalis, siluer money and other stuff'. Aside from the hoard discovered in these coffers, further royal treasure was recovered from former royal supporters, the countess of Atholl and the former treasurer, the abbot of Arbroath and an additional box was extracted from the mire. In all, the treasurer, lord St.John seems to have received a total of £24,517-10/- from the late king's fortune.[38] In addition, a coffer containing a further £4,000 and the sword of Robert Bruce was discovered on the field of battle by a certain Walter Simpson who was rewarded with a life grant of lands in Menteith.[39] Such a substantial stock of coin and jewelry could not possibly have been accumulated from the traditional crown revenues. In the sole treasurer's account for the reign of James III, it was recorded that the treasurer was charged with £104, in part payment of a total sum of £500, of which he had already received £100 and the remaining £296 'is pait to the Kingis coffris, as the Archidene of Sanctandros beris witnes' while in 1476,

---

36. ER, iv, 578.

37. ER, v, 328, 440-4, 455-6.

38. TA, i, 79-87, 166-7. This fortune was used to bolster the accounts of lord St.John, treasurer and by early 1492 only £1,417 remained. TA, i, 196.

39. ER, xi, 82, 187, 502, 682.

the same archdeacon, named as William Schevez had accepted £56-8-4 from the moneyers bound for the king's coffers.[40] Although there are isolated references to payments made into the royal coffers from local accountants - in 1486 the lessee of Strathdee and Cromar, Alexander Gordon of Midmar, submitted £50 to the king, which was received on his behalf of Nicholas Ramsey[41] - it is clear that the bulk of this fortune came from elsewhere. There is no further information concerning James III's private hoard which may have been lost or distributed to his supporters before Sauchieburn, although on 26 June 1498 sir Oliver Sinclair of Roslin was summoned before the Lords of the Council for the illegal detention of 1,000 crowns 'or therby' which had belonged to James III.[42] However, despite the cash retained by Sinclair and Parliament's statement that 'quhilkis treessour and substance com never to the handis of oure soverane lord that now is bot a small litle parte theirof to litle avale or quantite, in regard of the gret tressour that he had in depos', it is difficult to imagine that James III's fortune stretched to much more than was recovered for it is extremely unlikely that James would have distributed vast sums of cash to supporters from whom it would have been difficult to recover even should he have been successful at Sauchieburn.

Being a private source of revenue no records have survived to provide conclusive evidence as to the origin of the money acquired or the use made of it. Apart from transfers of cash from local royal accountants, it is likely that a substantial portion of the cash involved was derived from loans from both local and foreign sources. James III, being 'wondrous covettous in conquissing of money'[43] undoubtedly tapped a variety of sources in order to augment his private wealth. It is likely that income which was not accounted for by either the local or central fiscal officials found its way into the king's private treasury, that is the profit from ecclesiastical vacancies and presentations not recorded in the official rolls,

---

40. TA, i, 12. ER, viii, 392.

41. ER, ix, 385.

42. ADC, ii, 233.

43. Pitscottie, The History and Chronicles of Scotland, ed., Mackay, ii, 163.

the purchase of office and dignities coupled with the profit from the mint, the returns from certain tax levies and the fees extracted from the employment of the great seal and signet which, during the latter part of the reign of James IV, were transferred to the treasurer in order to bolster his financial position in the face of mounting expenditure. The evidence for the reign of James IV suggests that he was frequently short of ready cash and employed various means of augmenting his private stock. The king resorted to borrowing, pawning various expensive articles and alchemy.[44] From the treasurers' accounts for the reign of James IV, it is clear that that official was constantly supplying the king personally with large sums of money for his own use. Throughout the year ending in mid summer 1508 a total of £1,202 was transmitted to the king both for his personal use and also to sustain his losses at cards.[45] More particularly, in the month of December 1507 a total of £692 was allowed to the treasurer for the losses sustained by the king at cards and dice,[46] while on 15 December 1512 £60 was delivered to the dean of Glasgow 'for the furnesing of the Kingis purs the tyme His Grace past to Quhiteherne' and in July 1513 a further £560 was given to the king 'in his closet'.[47]

In a similar vein to many of the Mediaeval popes, the private income of the Scottish crown was utilised for military purposes. Pope John XXII contributed 400,000 gold florins from his secret treasury to the financing of the war in Lombardy.[48] Although the Scottish crown was unable to sustain the cost of a standing army, it was possible to finance a short term campaign against rebels or expeditions into the north of England. In the few years before 1513, for instance, the cost of preparing both the king's artillery and navy for the assault against England was an extremely expensive operation which consumed a substantial amount of

---

44. TA, i, 330, 367, 404, ii, 138, iv, 357.
45. TA, iv, 71-141.
46. TA, iv, 86-92.
47. TA, iv, 400, 419.
48. See Partner, 'Camera Papae'; the Problems of Papel Finance in the later Middle Ages', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 3-4, for details of administration of the Papel secret treasury.

the treasurers' receipts. However, a detailed record of the shipbuilding, artillery and building accounts for the year prior to August 1513 revealed an aggregate expenditure in excess of the gross income of treasurer, Cuthbert Baillie at £10,275,[49] of which only £2,600 was detailed to be spent on public works and shipping and a further £875 handed over to John Forman, who seems to have been engaged in provisioning ships on the west coast.[50] Since only £7,952 was derived from the traditional sources of revenue associated with the treasurer, that is compositions for charters, feudal incidents, recognition and escheats, between August 1512 and the same month a year later - no compositions were recorded from justice ayres - it would appear that a large portion of the cost of the Flodden preparations was subsidised through the direct payment of several compositions for the sale of remissions and the gift of feudal incidents towards these preaprations and also by means of the king's private fortune. It would also appear that, as in Rome, this stock of royal wealth was occasionally used to reduce the deficits accumulated by central fiscal officials. Between August and October 1512, the treasurer, Andrew, bishop of Caithness, received £300 directly from the king.[51]

In many respects it is possible to compose the personal hoards accumulated by Scottish kings in the fifteenth century with the use of the royal coffers in the chamber as the principal receiving agency for the crown as introduced in England by Edward IV. Concerning the latter, the Edwardian chamber became the principal treasury of the English crown and which was under the personal control of the crown. Because of the chambers' close association with the king and because the treasurer of the chamber rendered his accounts directly to the king in secret, it is not surprising that before the reign of Henry VII, these rolls have failed to survive, making it extremely difficult to asses the total income of the English crown under Edward IV. In Scotland, although the bulk of the king's revenue was declared openly by the comptroller and treasurer, there existed the king's personal coffers

---

49. TA, iv, 396.

50. TA, iv, 446-7.

51. TA, iv, 360.

about which there is little information.[52] It would seem that cash was derived from a variety of sources, it was undoubtedly under the king's personal control and what audits there were would have been conducted in private. The accident of the discovery of the personal fortune of James III in 1488 is the only clear insight into the nature and scope of this mysterious income.

Marriage treaties in the later Middle Ages were arranged not only with the diplomatic possibilities in view but also in the light of the payment of a considerable amount of money as the bride's dowry. On 20 March 1449-50 Nicholas Otterburn, the king's secretary, and John Dalrymple, a merchant, were appointed the king's special procurators for the collection of 20,000 'scute' from Philip, duke of Burgundy as the second instalment of the dowry promised with Mary of Guelders.[53] On 1 May a letter of receipt was issued under the great seal for the sum demanded but since such receipts were usually drawn up in advance of the payment, there is no actual proof that the money was handed over. Conclusive proof that payment was in fact made can usually be guaranteed if the letter of receipt is found in the archives of the payer not the payee. It would appear that, in this case, there is no way of confirming that the dowry reached James II.[54] Such windfalls, if received either contributed to the king's private hoard or else were expended in the purchase of luxury items from abroad. Although the duke of Burgundy may have been forthcoming in the payment of the dowry, James III's father-in-law, the king of Denmark, seems to have been unable to muster the necessary cash. Of the 60,000 Rhenish florins stipulated in the marriage treaty, only 2,000 were paid and for the remainder, the islands of Orkney and Shetland were pledged to the king of Scotland, with whom they were destined to remain.[55] In February 1471-2 the islands were permanently annexed by Parliament to the Scottish crown 'nocht to be gevin away in

---

52. For details of Edward IV's chamber, see Wolfe, The Royal Demesne in English History, 168-180.
53. RMS, ii, 329.
54. RMS, ii, 345.
55. ER, viii, LXXVII-LXXXVII. The amrriage treaty is printed in full in the appendix to the introduction of this volume of the Exchequer Rolls.

tyme to cum to na persoune nor persounis except anerly til ane the kingis sonis of lauchfull bed'.[56] In fact, this property settlement proved to be of greater benefit to the Scottish crown than the payment of 60,000 Rhenish florins would have been. The marriage treaty binding the future James IV to Cecilia, daughter of Edward IV of England, in 1474 recorded a dowry of 20,000 English marks (that is around 60,000 Scots marks) to be submitted in annual instalments of 2,000 marks. The first three payments were duly made in February 1475, 1476, 1477 by master Alexander Lye, almoner to Edward IV, but the marriage never took place and in 1482, the community of Edinburgh became surety for the repayment of cash already handed over.[57] The marriage treaty between James IV and Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII, involved the payment of a dowry of 30,000 angel nobles (only £10,000 sterling).[58] On 10 August 1503 the first instalment was received in Edinburgh and two a year later, the third and final contribution was paid over by the English commissioners at Coldingham.[59] The entire dowry, which was equivalent to £35,000 Scots was delivered to the treasurer in order to offset the effect of increased royal spending.[60] However, this substantial windfall was quickly dissipated, for by August 1506 the treasurer, James Beaton, abbot of Dunfermline, could boast of a surplus of over £20,000, even after sustaining the cost of the wedding, but by September 1507 the balance had been reduced to just over £9,000 and, in the account ending August 1508, Beaton was over expended to the tune of almost £2,500.[61] Although the dowry was merely submerged into the pool of cash handled by the treasurer and it is, therefore, extremely difficult to trace its actual disposal, but it doubtless helped to swell James's resources for foreign purchases. James's part of the marriage contract involved the infeftment of the queen in property to

---

56. APS, ii, 102.

57. Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland, iv, 1425, 1437, 1446. Rymer, Foedera, xi, 824-32, 850, xii, 23, 41, 161-2.

58. Rymer, Feodera, xii, 787-92.

59. RMS, ii, 2740, 2868.

60. TA, ii, 196, iii, 33.

61. TA, iii, 210, 417, iv, 141.

the value of £6,000 Scots to sustain her in widowhood. In the interim Margaret was to receive an annual pension of £1,000 which was to be paid by the treasurer to Margaret's treasurer or almoner.[62]

Direct taxation was heavily bound to the Stubbsian myth of the king's 'own'. According to Stubbs, the king's revenue was divided into the 'ordinary', namely the income derived from the royal patrimony, and the 'extraordinary' which was confined to the proceeds arising from taxation. Stubbs and his followers insisted that the Mediaeval king was expected to 'live of his own', that is, live on his 'ordinary'. However, even in the reign of Henry VII, the king's 'own' consisted ofvery much more than the profits from his landed property or his great customs. Throughout the later Middle Ages, it was recognised that the king's 'own' included that to which he was legally entitled as distinct from that which belonged to his subjects. In fact, the question of the king's 'own' arose in response to the introduction of purveyance in the fourteenth century which involved the acquisition of goods to which the king had no legal right. But in Mediaeval Scotland, as in England and many other European states, direct taxation, justified by some accepted cause or pretext, was considered legally accepted part of the king's income. The late Mediaeval period in England witnessed a proliferation of taxes which varied in form according to the changes in the distribution of wealth and which were raised to make an effective contribution to the expenses of government.

In Scotland, the most common pretexts for the raising of a tax levy were the marriage of the king or his closest relatives, the defence of the realm or the sending of a diplomatic mission abroad. The imposition of a tax on all three estates was normally granted with the consent of Parliament although, on occasions, by the king's council. On 6 March 1478-9 a tax of 20,000 marks was voted for the marriage of Margaret, the sister of James III, to Anthony, earl Rivers.[63]

Embassies were frequently sent to foreign courts to discover the possibilities of a match or to arrange the details of a marriage settlement. In January 1467-8

---

62. Rymer, Feodera, xii, 789-90, xiii, 57-8. RMS, ii, 2721. TA, iii, 37, 268, 416, iv, 28-9, 217.

63. APS, ii, 122.

£3,000 was to be raised for the expenses of an embassy bound for Denmark to arrange the marriage ot James III, in October 1488 £5,000 was granted for a mission to France and elsewhere to find a suitable bride for the new king, James IV and in 1501, a contribution of 5,000 marks and 500 crowns was raised 'to the furneising of the expensis of our honorabill ambassiat to be send in Ingland for the completing of our mariage'.[64] Concerning the expenses of other embassies, on 6 May 1471, a tax of 3000 crowns was granted by Parliament for the expenses of a diplomatic mission to be sent to the king of France and the duke of Burgundy 'to labour diligently for trety and concorde twix tham'.[65] On 3 February 1489-90 an embassy sent to the king of Denmark 'for the renewing of the aliances and confirmacioun of the confederacioun' between the two kings received a contribution of £300 and in April a further 400 marks was voted for another mission to Denmark.[66]

Military ventures or the 'defence of the realm' frequently demanded the granting of a tax contribution. In April 1481, 7,000 marks was voted by Parliament for the victualling of Berwick for 40 days and the following March the estates were to sustain the cost of garissoning the borders with 600 men.[67] Concerning the latter contribution, it was stated that, considering the expenditure sustained by the king in the provision of 500 men in Berwick, Parliament undertook to maintain a further 600 men on the borders for a period of three months, half of whom were to be spearmen, in receipt of 2/6 a day, and half bowmen, whose daily wage amounted to 2/-. In the first few years of the sixteenth century a tax of £12,000 was to be raised to pay for the cost of sending ships and men to assist the king of Denmark.[68] In addition, direct taxation was levied for the purchase of munitions, to defend the privileges of Scottish merchants abroad and to sustain the expenses of the sojourn of the duke of York, alias Perkin Warbeck, in Scotland.[69]

---

64. APS, ii, 90, 207. Supplementary Register House charters.
65. APS, ii, 99.
66. APS, ii, 219.
67. APS, ii, 134, 139-40.
68. SRO, Skene, 'Tabill and repertour of the Cheker Rollis', 104. TA, ii, 196.
69. ER, vi, 305. APS, ii, 118. RSS, i, 405.

The payment of these contributions fell on the three estates, the clergy, the nobility and the burghs. However, the size of the extent apportioned to each estate varied in the fifteenth century, presumably according to the ability of each section of the community to pay. In January 1467-8 each estated submitted an equal share of the £3,000 levy but, on 20 February 1471-2, the prelates and the barons each contributed £2,000 to the cost of the passage of 6,000 men to France and the burghs only £1,000.[70] This ratio continued as the norm during the reigns of James III and IV, although in 1490 and 1491 there was a temporary reversion to the earlier arrangement.[71]

Although the share associated with each estate tended to be fixed the basis of payment within each estate varied considerably. However, the tax granted for the sending of an embassy to Denmark in May 1491 stated that 'certane of ilke estate convene in the blak freris to provide for the said taxt and for the sure payment thairof to be incontinent and elikwise of the taxt grantit to our soverane lordis mariage'.[72]

Concenring barons and freeholders, details of the contributions in the first half of the fifteenth century suggested that both land and moveable goods were the basis of temporal taxation. In the general contribution for the 'kingis costage and the deliverance of his hostages, beand in Inglande' it was related that the levy was to be raised at the extent of 1/- on each pound 'of all the landis rentis malyis and gudis of lordis within thar propyt demannys bath corn and catale Bot for the extent of the propyt demannys thai sall not pay drawyne oxin riddyne horse and utensillis of house allanerly outane'.[73] In 1455 for the payment of the wages and expenses of a garrison of 300 spearmen and 300 bowmen on the three marches, the

---

70. APS, ii, 90, 99, 102.

71. APS, ii, 219, 224

72. APS, ii, 224.

73. APS, ii, 4. Details were given of the tax equivalent of each moveable commodity, for instance, a boll of wheat was assessed at 2/-, a boll of oats at 6d and a wedder and ewe at 1/- each.

sheriffs were instructed to send to the king the names of all the barons and freeholders along with the value of their lands, rents, possessions and moveable goods, 'alsone as thai may be extentyt'.[74] However, the basis of temporal taxation was the value of land according to the 'old extent'. In 1424 the following arrangement was put into operation, namely that the sheriff was to summon all the barons and freeholders of the king within his shire and 'with consale of thame he sall cheise lele men and discret' to extent all the land and goods within the shire. As a result of the work of these 'extentors' 'that be maid a buk of the said extent contenande the namys of ilke towne in speciale and the namys of ilke persone duallande in thay townys and thar gudis folowande thar namys' and the book was to be presented to the king's auditors at Perth on 12 July. It was also stated that all the lands and goods of the 'of the kinrik be taxt efter as thai are of vale now and that but fraude or nile'. Further, it was related that, at the time of the valueation, all those liable were informed that payment was to be forthcoming within fifteen days of the tax in gold and silver and failing payment within this time, the sheriff's officer was to poind the goods of the offender.[75] In January 1467-8 Parliament ordained that an inquisition be undertaken in each sire 'to retour agane the vale of ilk mannis rent' and these retours were then delivered to the abbot of Holyrood, sir Alexander Napier and Thomas Oliphant who were to 'modyfiit and set the said taxt evinly apoun all the personis that are ordanit to contribut therto'.[76] On 6 Marh 1478-9 Parliament voted a contribution of 20,000 marks in instalments for the marriage to the king's sister, Margaret to earl Rivers and on 26 March the sheriff of Edinburgh held an inquest and made a retour of the value of the property within the shire. This was examined and, on 27 August 1479, it was returned to the sheriff along with a royal warrant, signed by the king, ordering the raising of a tax of 2/- for every pound's worth of property, excepting the lands in the king's

---

74: APS, ii, 45.

75: APS, ii, 4.

76: APR, ii, 90.

hands and those granted in mortmain.[77] However, this system of tax assessment involved a considerable amount of delay between the voting of the contribution in Parliament and the issuing of the royal warrant to initiate the collection of the levy. In the reign of James IV the system was accelerated. On 20 February 1491-2 Parliament granted a tax of £1,000 to sustain the cost of an embassy to France and on 9 March royal letters under the signet were distributed to the various sheriffs instructing them to summon the barons and freeholders within the shire to the principal burgh in order to choose twenty four 'best of understanding and of discretion' who , on oath, were to provide a list of all the lands within a sheriff-dom along with the names of every baron and freeholder and the value of the land 'of auld extent as it extenid to'. The sheriffs were subsequently ordered to raise the tax at the rate of 2/- of every pound land of old extent and to 'inbring the sammyn within this moneth of Marche'.[78] Despite the all-embracing nature of these royal directives, not all property was liable for tax payment for crown property and royal estated held in feufarm, lands temporarily in the king's hands through ward and property gifted in mortmain to an ecclesiastical body tended to be exempt.

There is every reason to believe that the burghs arranged their own extents without the outside dictates of the crown. In an early tax roll involving the burghs north of the Forth it was stated that the 'taxt of the same modifiit be the commissaris of the burghis the tyme of the Parliament haldin in Edinburgh',[79] while on 23 August 1501 John Wormet, Andrew Murray, Gilbert Menzies, James Colison, Andrew Cullan, Robert Blindsele and Alexander Grey were chosen by the community of Aberdeen 'and suorne ther gret aithe' to tax and extent the burgh for 100 marks and 15 crowns for the expenses of the ambassadors sent to England for the completion of the king's marriage.[80] There is evidence of alterations in the share submitted by

---

77. Miscellany of the Banatyne Club , iii, 427.

78. SRO, Mar and Dellie Muniments. APS, ii, 230.

79. Miscellany of Spanding Club, v, 27.

80. Extracts from the Council Records of Aberdeen, 71.

each burgh and also of negotiation between the burgh and the crown over the extent of the contribution. On 29 March 1495 it was stated in a letter of James IV to Richard McDowel, 'sheriff in that part' that the chancellor, Archibald, earl of Angus, had compounded with the burghs for sums to be paid 'siclik as utheris the prelatis, baronis and burrowis of our realme, dois for expedicioun of gret materis, concerning ws, the commone weile of our realme and liegis, in great nernesse'. The assessments concluded gave some inpression of the relative value of certain of the leading burghs in the northern part of the country, for Aberdeen was to submit £200, Montrose £50, Dundee £250, Brechin £30, Forfar 20 marks, Arbroath £30, Perth £150, Cupar £50 and St.Andrews £100 and Richard McDowal was instructed to collect the sums settled by the chancellor from each of the above burghs.[81] Liability for taxation covered not only the various royal burghs but also the important ecclesiastical burghs of St.Andrews, Dunfermline, Arbroath and Glasgow.[82]

The basis for the assessment of the clergy was still in accordance with the Bagimond's Roll of 1275.[83] In 1424 each bishop was to instruct his official and dean within each deanery of his diocese to summon all the tenants and freeholders and chose 'taxatouris' to tax both the kirks and the lands and collect the tax in the same manner as that raised from the barons.[84] On 20 February 1471-2, in a fragmentary entry in the Acts of Parliament some indication was given of the relative value of certain see for, of the £2,000 to be raised by the clerical estate, the bishoprics of Ross and Brechin were each assessed for £60, Caithness and Orkney for £50, Dunblane and Galloway for £100 and Argyll for £40.[85]

---

81. Ibid, 55-6.

82. Rait, Parliaments of Scotland, 256-7.

83. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, vi, 3-77.

84. APS, ii, 4

85. APS, ii, 102.

In the majority of cases, Parliament appointed auditors or receivers to collect the proceeds of the contribution. In October 1431 Parliament ordained that the tax for resisting the king's rebels in the north was to be 'raisit with all celerite possible broucht and deliverit to the auditouris of it (namely the abbots of Inchcolm and Balmorynock, sir John Scimgeour and John Fife of Aberdeen) quhilkis sal begyn thare comptis on the morn next eftir the fest of the purificacion of our lady next to cum at Perth gife the pestilence be not thare. Ande gif it beis thare at Sanctandrois the quhilkis auditouris sal put this contribucion in a kist of oure keyis of the quhilkis keyis ilk ane of tham sal haf ane and that kist to remayn in the castel of Sanctandrois under the keping of the bischop ande the priour'.[86] In January 1467-8 it was stated that the abbot of Holyrood was to be receiver of the tax of the clergy, sir Alexander Napier of the barons and Thomas Oliphant of the burghs.[87] On 10 July 1499 Andrew Wood of Fettercairn was granted a letter of quittance under the privy seal for the sum of £501 'pait and deliverit be the said Andro to Duncan Forester of Skipinch, knicht, comptrollar for the tyme of the taxt of the north half the water of Forth, for the sustentation of the duke of York'.[88]

It is clear that, at least in the reign of James IV, the treasurer accounted for the proceeds of certain tax levies. Skene noted an account made by David Beaton for the tax proceeds of £12,000 for the expenses of an army which was sent to Denmark in 1502 of which £171 appeared as the rest of this contribution in the February 1504-5 account of David Beaton.[89] In 1492 the sheriff of Stirling was instructed to deliver the revenue from the contribution to the treasurer 'with the forsaid autentik roll for compt makin of the said taxt'.[90] In January 1496-7 account of treasurer, George, abbot of Paisley, a total of £40 was collected from the bishop of Dunblane and the abbot of Newbottle for the construction of Tarbert castle [91]

---

86. APS, ii, 20.
87. APS, ii, 90.
88. RSS, i, 405.
89. TA, ii, 196. SRO, Skene, 'Tabill and repertour of the Cheker rollis'.
90. SRO, Mar and Kellie Muniments.
91. TA, i, 215.

while in the account ending July 1498 the treasurer accounted for £20 from the community of Wigtown for the 'taxt of the Ilis' and a further £1,071-4-6 for the tax of spears collected from certain sheriffs and ecclesiastical foundations during the scope of this account.[92] Between 1512 and 1513 the treasurers' accounts recorded the receipt of a total of £10,930 from a contribution granted by the clergy and which was paid by ministers, priors, abbots, deans, rectors, vicars, provosts and other officials on behalf of their benefices.[93]

The loss of a large proportion of the documented evidence concerning the collection of taxation in Mediaeval Scotland makes it extremely difficult to ascertain the percentage of cash collected to the amount voted by Parliament. Assuming Scottish taxation followed the same trend as its European counterparts, it is probable that there was considerable difficulty in enforcing not only full payment but also prompt payment. Following the granting of a tax of £500 for the expenses of an embassy to England concerning the marriage of the king and the prince, it was stated that 'this taxt be incontinent raisit and brocht in that it ma be redy to deliver to the said ambassat befor the day of the passage sa that in defalt thareof thai be nocht tarijt as the last embassat was'.[94] The failure to produce the cash in time for the purpose for which it was intended, or indeed at all, was a serious problem facing the crown. It is clear that various sections of all three estated were guilty of dragging their feet as regard the payment of national taxes. In 1464 or 1465 an inquiry was set up to ascertain who was responsible for 'nocht payt thare taxt', in fact, 'quhethir the falt be into the schireffis or in the personis that suld have payt the saide taxt'.[95] From the neagre evidence available, it would appear that the sheriff as in the collection of other items of crown revenue, was an inefficient means of collection. On 6 October 1488 a tax of £5,000 was voted for the expenses of an embassy to be sent to France, Brittany and Spain

---

92. TA, i, 312-3.

93. TA, iv, 172-3, 391-6, 401.

94. APS, ii, 170.

95. APS, xii, Supp. 31.

in connection with the possible marriage of the new king but, on 3 February 1489-90 concerning the temporal portion of the contribution for which sheriffs, baillies and other royal officers were responsible, it was concluded that 'being sa oft tymmes chargeit be the kingis lettrez and ar now callit to be here that tharefore thai be now of new chargeit be ane officiare of the kingis to be before the chancellare and lordis of Consale on friday that nixt cumis in George Robinsonis Innys to mak full compt and payment of the said taxt' and those who failed to obey the summons were to enter themselves in ward in Blackness castle within fifteen days. Also, those officers who were reluctant to make full payment were to be put to the horn and their goods were to be escheat to the crown.[96] In 1493 those prelated, sheriffs, burgh commissioners and other tax collectors who failed to make full account of their share of the contribution were ordered to be put in ward and their lands and goods prised for the outstanding sums.[97]

Reluctance on the part of the burghs to produce their full assessment was met not only by the threat of apprising the goods of their baillies but also by the recognition of the freedom and liberties of the burgh concerned. In 1501 a royal precept for the raising of arrears of taxation related that 'ye recognise adn sese in our handis the fredome of our said burrowis that has nocht paid thair partis of the said taxt as said is, chargeing all the inhabitandis thairof that thai us na privelege of our saidis burrowis be haldin of merkatis nor otheris wais quhill thair partis of the said taxt be paid and our recognicioune lousit, under all pane and chargis that efter may follou'.[98] The freedom and liberties were jealously preserved by the burghal community and the possible removal of these privileges seems to have stimulated the burgh authorities into action. In 1484, for instance the community of Aberdeen agreed to be stented for 40 marks as their share of the contribution for the ambassadors to England 'nochtwithstanding that the samyn taxt

---

96. APS, ii, 207, 218.

97. APS, ii, 233-4.

98. SRO, Supplementary Register House Charters

was pait be the communite of before, and deliverit til sir Jhon of Ruthirfurd, aldirman for the tyme. and for the eschewing of the recognitioun of the fredom of this burgh, the communite grantit til a new tax as said is'.[99] The clergy also faced the possibility of the poinding of their goods.

From the evidence recorded in the treasurers' accounts and other sources, it is clear that a certain amount of cash was collected from the three estates for these tax contributions but what is more difficult to assess is the proportion in relations to the original tax estimate. The constant need to repeat the consequences of the non payment of these proceeds suggests that the crown had great difficulty in extracting anything like a full return. In addition, in 1489 Sperdour was presented with 18/- 'to pass with letteris of the Kingis a al the schireffs in the sowtht partis and est, and to abotis, for the alde taxt and new'.[100] On 5 May 1505 Fergy Grame received expenses of 2/- to travel to the sheriff and burgh of Perth 'for the taxt quhilk wes devisit for ane passage in Denmark and failzeit.[101] However it is doubt ful if the crown was able to extract anything like a complete return from these tax levies, especially from areas which defied the crown in many other fields.

There is little evidence concerning the attitude of the subscribers to the levying of these contributions but it would be only normal if they were met with unpopularity and a desire to avoid full payment of their portion. James I's desperation for ready cash included the exploitation of taxation. In 1431 a contribution was to be raised from 'all landis of the realme quhare the zelde of two pannys was raisit thar be now xd raisit and quhare the two pennys was nocht raisit thare be now raisit xijd of ilke punde'.[102] However, the taxation introduced by James I was met with considerable resistance. Bower showed instances of the contribution being halted or delayed by pleas of poverty. Concerning the

---

99. Miscellany of the Spalding Club, v, 28

100. TA, i, 127.

101. TA, iii, 139.

102. APS, ii, 20.

tax being raised for the king's ransom, for which i/- in the pound was taken from goods, land farms, annual rents and grain, both spiritual and temporal, for the period of two years, it was stated that, in the first year, a total of 14,000 marks was collected, but, in the second year much less was forthcoming following pleas of poverty which forced the king to delay the collection of that portion of the impost until 1433.[103] Again, in 1431 a contribution was ordered to pay for the expenses of an embassy to the king of France and for the marriage of the daughter of James I to the dauphin of France, and, in response, the populace began to murmur against the king stating that their wealth had been dissipated by such imposts, with the result, that the king ordered the auditors of the tax to return all the proceeds received by the various collectors.[104] A substantial tax often necessitated an extended period for collection. In March 1478-9 Parliament voted a contribution of 20,000 marks for the marriage of Margaret, sister of James III, and earl Rivers half of which was to be submitted by the next feast of St.John the Baptist while the remainder was to be paid within the next three years.[105]

Although in theory the burghal tax contribution amounted to only 1/6th of the total levy, during most of the fifteenth century, it would appear that in fact the bulk of the burden of royal taxes tended to fall on the burghs, probably because they were easier to threaten and because the interests of the crown and the royal burghs were closely bound together. In 1424 the burgh commissioners undertook to make the first payment of 20,000 nobles of the king's ransom 'sua that n strangeris by na haif away the merchandise of the lande at uther menis handis.'[106] Certain taxes were levied solely on the mercantile community. In 1457 certain burghs submitted a contribution which paid for the expenses of ambassadors travelling to France and for the purchase of artillery[107] while in 1478, to defray

---

103. Scotichronicon, book, xvi, 9.

104. Ibid, book, xvi, 9. APS, ii, 20.

105. APS, ii, 122.

106. APS, ii, 6. There is no evidence of any contribution by barons or clergy.

107. ER, vi, 305.10.

the cost of sending an ambassy to Burgundy to seek the renewal of the alliance and to preserve the privileges of Scottish merchants in that region, a contribution was raised from all the burghs.[108] However, by the beginning of the sixteenth century, the clerical share of national contributions increased substantially. In the final two years before Flodden, considerable sums of money were received by the treasurer from a tax levied on the clergy.[109]

Although the proceeds of many tax contributions did, in fact, find their way to the original cause, the tax raised from the burgh communities for the ransom of James I provided an ideal example of how the cash had been diverted to other uses. In July 1435 William Stephen, bishop of Dunblane, accounted as principal auditor and receiver of the tax for the two years' contribution of the Scottish burghs which amounted to £38,952 English nobles, only a fraction less than the 40,000 nobles which the burghs were due to contribute.[110] Bower mentioned that in the first year a total of 14,000 marks was forthcoming from the burghs but in the following year the proceeds were greatly reduced.[111] However, of this total receipt, only 16,800 nobles were actually received in England.[112] Of the remainder 3,481 nobles were paid to the king, 1,298 to William Foulis, keeper of the privy seal, 2,297 nobles to Robert Gray, the king's moneyer and a portion was also transmitted to the comptroller and treasurer. In addition, 1,716 nobles were paid over to John Duchman and 7,585 nobles and 175 Flemish groats were supplied to John Turing, both of whom were engages in making substantial purchases for the king in the Low Countries.[113] Two subsequent accounts revealed the destination of most of the

---

108. APS, ii, 118. Miscellany of the Spalding Club, v, 26.

109. For details of James V's reign, see Stanford Reid, 'Clerical Taxation, The Scottish Alternative to the Dissolution of the Monestaries, 1530-1568, Catholic Historial Review, xxxiv, 129-153. TA, iv, 173, 365, 391-6.

110. An English noble was equivalent to 6/8 in Scots or half a mark.

111. Scotichronicon, Book, xvi, 9.

112. The money actually sent to England was assigned by the king to Richard Buckland, treasurer of Calais, to meet the expenses there and a small portion was also received by the earl of Northumberland in repayment of his expenses in connection with the town of Berwick and the east marches.

113. ER, iv, 639-665.

king's ransom. Of William Foulis's receipts, 842 nobles were transferred to John Duchman and the remainder contributed to royal purchases in Flanders and to the redemption of the lands of Merchameston from Alexander Napier.[114] The account of John Turing, burgess of Edinburgh, on 5 September 1436, recorded a receipt of 3,273 Flemish groats from the ransom (the English nobles had been converted into Flemish coin since Turing made the bulk of his purchases in Flanders), most of which was expended on artillery, the repayment of loans raised in the Low Countries, a variety of luxury items, namely wine, ostrich feathers, jewels, expensive clothes and ornaments and the expense of transportation.[115] Thus, over half the proceeds of the burgh's contribution to the king's ransom was expended on the king's behalf, in other words, James I had employed the impost to his own benefit. From the avidence in English manuscripts, it seems that James was extremely lax in the payment of his ransom. It was fixed at the time of his release in 1424 at 60,000 in English marks, of which 10,000 marks were deducted for the dowry which accompanied Joan Beaufort, who had married the king of Scotland, and the remainder was to be paid off in five annual instalments.[116] From the evidence which has survived, it would appear that of the total ransom, the English king received only around 9,000 marks. Since there are no further tax accounts for the late Mediaeval period, it is difficult to assess the amount of cash which was diverted from the intention for which is was raised. But the contribution receipts collected by the treasurer seem to have fallen into the morass of royal expenditure and this is particularly true of the clerical subsidy received by the treasurer in the two years before Flodden.

The king claimed the right to grant tax exemptions to various favoured individuals although this was met with considerable disapproval. In February 1489-90 concerning the tax to be raised for embassies sent abroad to negotiate the king's marriage, it was realised that the king had granted to both spiritual and temporal lords and also the burghs letter of discharge of part of their tax assessment and

---

114. ER, iv, 666-7.

115. ER, iv, 672-685.

116. Rotuli Scotiae, ii, 246.

'consideris and understandis the king micht nocht discharge sen it was grantit be the estates to the said ambaxiat... and the said mettrez of discharge be na defensance to thaim and that na sic lettrez have no strenth force nor effect'.[117]

From the evidence available, it is clear that, from the return of James I to Scotland in 1424, until the death of James IV in 1513, successive Scottish kings pursued a deliberate policy of accumulating sufficient revenue to offset the increasing cost of royal government. Although individual kings tended to concentrate on specific methods of achieving this end, for instance James I greatly extended royal property and introduced customs duties on exports which had previously been free of this levy while James IV actively exploited the profits from royal justice and feudal casualties and also augmented the rent levels from the crown demesne, there was an overall attempt by the crown to extract the maximum profit from all aspects of the king's 'own'. Various methods were adopted by the Scottish crown during the late Mediaeval period to secure more money; the steady acquisition of property which was not immediately alienated in the interest of patronage confirmed by acts of Annexation, the increase in rents from the latter part of the fifteenth century, with the introduction of longer leases and feufarm, the exploitation of royal justice and feudal casualties, the large scale minting of new, debased coinage and the government's attempt to restrict patronage by inquiring into administrative technicalities connected with the possession of property, life grants, pensions and customs exemptions. However, these and other expedients were all part of a more general change in royal policy initiated by James I and carried on by his successors. In 1424 the attitude of the Scottish crown, in common with the monarchy in England, towards its patrimony had altered; for, instead of the profit from property, customs, justice, feudal incidents and administrative fees being dispersed in the interests of patronage - one of the principal means open to the king to attract the support and loyalty of its principal subjects - the cash from these sources was not systematically collected by royal officers in order to contribute towards the financing of the royal household and administration. Although

---

117. APS, ii, 218.

the crown could not dispense with patronage completely, during the fifteenth century the extent was severely curtailed and means were abailable to ensure that what grants that were made would be under constant review by royal administrators. Following the victory of Robert I and during the period of political confusion between Robert's death and the return of James I, the demands of royal patronage had eaten up most of what the crown,had at one time possessed in the shape of hereditary grants of property and customs receipts, pensions, exemptions from customs, feudal casualty dues and judicial and administrative fines. The inevitable result was that little actual cash found its way to the royal coffers. After 1424 royal patrimony ceased to be alienated to favoured subjects in such a lavish scale and the profit was now diverted to contribute towards royal expenses. James I and succeeding kings during the later Mediaeval period realised that a poor king was inevitably a weak one and that the strength of the crown depended on a reliable flow of cash. The interests of royal patronage, although not ignored completely, were now subordinate to the demands of crown expenditure. The dramatic increase in the revenue available to the crown in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries provided successive monarchs with the means to invest in items which were essential to the prestige and power of the crown. Expenditure on artillery, shipping, public works, a well developed royal household and a variety of luxurious purchases and expensive pursuits ensured that the Scottish crown was elevated well above ints greatest subjects. The move towards fiscal independance between 1424 and 1513 was probably the principal reason for the strengthening of the crown which, by the death of James IV, had become a powerful institution.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A/1 (a) LIST OF ROYAL OFFICERS

LIST OF TREASURERS, 1424-1513

(Handbook of British Chronology, 180-1 Accounts of Lord High Treasurers, Vols 1-IV)

	Date of Appointment	Date of Removal
1. Sir Walter Ogilvy of Luntrethan	Jan 1425	?
2. Thomas Myreton, dean of Glasgow	Jan 1431	June 1431
3. Walter Stewart, dean of Moray	Nov 1432	Sept 1433
4. Thomas Cranston	1435	?
5. Sir Walter Haliburton of Dirleton	May 1437	?
6. John Alston, bishop of Dunkeld	Aug 1449	Sept 1449
7. Andrew Hunter, abbot of Melrose	Nov 1449	Mar 1452
8. John Winchester, bishop of Moray	1454	?
9. Archibald Crawford, abbot of Holyrood	1456	?
10. James Stewart, bishop of Moray	Nov 1457	June 1459
11. David Guthrie of that Ilk	1461	May 1468
12. James Lindsay, provost of Lincluden	1468	?
13. Sir William Knollis, preceptor of Torphichen	Jan 1469	July 1470
14. John Laing, vicar of Linlithgow	Sept 1470	Dec 1474
15. Archibald Crawford, abbot of Holyrood	Dec 1474	?
16. David Lichton, abbot of Arbroath	June 1486	June 1488
17. Sir William Knollis	June 1488	Aug 1492
18. Henry Arnot, abbot of Cambuskenneth	Aug 1492	June 1494
19. George Shaw, abbot of Paisley	June 1494	Sept 1497
20. Sir Robert Lundy of Balgony	Oct 1497	Feb 1501
21. David Beaton of Creich	Feb 1501	Jan 1505
22. James Beaton, abbot of Dunfermline	Feb 1505	June 1509
23. George Hepburn, abbot of Arbroath	Aug 1509	Aug 1510
24. Andrew Stewart, bishop of Caithness	Oct 1510	Oct 1512
25. Cuthbert Baillie, commendator of Glenluce	Oct 1512	Aug 1513

APPENDIX A/1 (b) LIST OF COMPTROLLERS FROM 1424 to 1513

DATE OF APPOINTMENT			DATE OF REMOVAL	
8 May	1425	David Brown, chancellor of Glasgow	12 Sept	1428
17 Dec	1428	John Spens	6 May	1431
21 May	1434	David Brown	11 July	1435
11 July	1435	Alexander Nairn	18 July	1438
26 April,	1439	Robert Nory	May	1439
	1439	William Cranstone	2 Sept	1441
5 July	1442	Henry Livingstone	27 June	1444
1 July	1444	Alexander Nairn	15 July	1447
18 April	1448	Robert Livingstone of Middle Bening	22 Aug	1449
24 Sept	1449	Alexander Napier of Philde	27 Aug	1450
31 Aug	1450	John Spalding	8 Sept	1450
	1450	Alexander Napier of Philde	9 March	1451
5 July	1451	Alexander Nairn of Sandford	15 Jan	1453
		(George Schoriswood acted as Nairn's deputy during the latter's absence in England between 21 April and 20 June 1452)		
1 Feb	1453	Richard Forbes, archdeacon of Ross	16 Oct	1453
	1453	Alexander Napier of Philde	Aug	1454
5 Aug	1454	William Bonar of Rossie	11 Sept	1455
3 Oct	1455	Richard Forbes, archdeacon of Ross	13 May	1456
13 Sept	1456	Alexander Napier of Philde	Sept	1456
15 Sept	1456	Ninian Scot, later bishop of Galloway	19 July	1459
	1460	John Learmonth		1460
19 June	1460	Alexander Napier of Merchiston	7 July	1461
		OFFICE VACANT		
5 Aug	1464	sir John Colquhoun of Luss	July	1466
July	1466	David Guthrie of that ilk	9 March	1468
20 May	1468	Adam Wallace of Craigie	7 Feb	1470
17 April	1470	David Guthrie of that ilk	1 Feb	1471
12 Feb	1471	James Shaw of Sauchie	25 April	1472
Aug/Sept	1472	Thomas Simpson of Knockhill	12 July	1475
15 July	1475	Alexander Leslie of Wardris	2 Aug	1483
27 Oct	1483	Thomas Simpson of Knockhill	23 Aug	1484
11 Sept	1484	Alexander Leslie of Wardris	2 Feb	1485
28 March	1485	Alexander Lumsden	6 Aug	1485
17 Aug	1485	David Luthirdale	20 Sept	1485
12 Oct	1485	Adam Wallace of Graigie	7 Nov	1485
16 Dec	1485	Thomas Simpson of Knockhill	2 Nay	1486

Date of Appointment		DATE OF REMOVAL
3 June 1486	George Robinson	8 March 1488
20 March 1488	John Bickerton	20 May 1488
1488	Thomas Tod	1488
15 June 1488	Alexander Inglis	31 May 1489
7 July 1489	James Douglas of Pittendriech	13 April 1490
7 June 1490	Thomas Forest	31 Oct 1491
1 Nov 1491	Hugh Martin	4 Aug 1492
31 July 1492	Duncan Forrester of Skipinch	10 Nov 1498
9 Nov 1498	sir Patrick Hume of Polworth	20 March 1500
31 March 1500	sir Robert Lundy of Balgony	15 Feb 1501
18 May 1501	sir John Stirling of Craigbernard	25 April 1505
1 May 1505	James Redheuch of Tullichedill	31 Aug 1508
1 Sept 1508	sir Duncan Forrester of Garden	9 Nov 1510
12 March 1511	Andrew Stewart, bishop of Caithness	October 1512
8 Oct 1512	James Redheuch of Tullichedill	23 Sept 1513.

This list is mostly derived from the compendium of comptrollers published in the Handbook of British Chronology, with minor alterations in dates following consultation of the Exchequer Rolls Vols IV-XIII and other sources. Although it is fairly certain that nearly all the holders of the office of comptroller are now know - there is a degree of vagueness concerning the reign of James I - it is almost impossible, through lack of evidence, to pinpoint the exact length of tenure of each official. The dates given in the chart give only the periods when it is certain that a particular person held the office of comptroller but the shortage of references resulted in gaps between the departure of one official and the arrival of his successor. For instance, it is known that Thomas Simpson held the office of comptroller on 23 Aug 1484 and that Alexander Leslie of Wardris was in office by 11 Sept, but when the transfer actually took place is not known. ER, ix, 575, 593.

APPENDIX A/1 (c) CUSTUMARS OF DUNDEE (ER, V-XLII)

1437-40	Simon Ferny	1437-41	David Spalding
1440-49	Patrick Lindsay	1441-44	Thomas Lees
1449-60	William Strathauchin	1444-74	David Spalding
1460-82	Robert Balmanoch	1474-Death Nov	Malcolm Guthrie
		1482-83	David Scrimgeour
		1483-86	James Fothringham
		1488-98	Walter Drummond
		Jan 1499	
		1498- -1500	George Carmichael
		1509-1513	James Wedderburn

APPENDIX A/1 (d) LIST OF CUSTUMARS OF EDINBURGH

Mar	June		Mar	May	
1405/6 -	1434	sir John Forrester of Corstorphine	1405/6-	1425	Alan Farnyle
			May	June	
			1425 -	1434	John Turing
June	July		June	July	
1434 -	1438	Thomas Berwick	1434 -	1435	John Swift
Jan	July		July	Aug	
1440/1	1442	John Turing	1436 -	1437	John Barker
April	April		Aug	July	
1443	1444	Robert Callendar	1437 -	1442	Thomas Cranstone
April	June		April	July	
1444	1444	George Faulay	1443 -	1450	William Bulley
June	July		July	July	
1444	1445	John Dalyrimple	1450 -	1451	Alexander Napier
July	July		July	Dec	
1445	1451	Thomas Cranstone	1451 -	1452	William Bully
July	June		Dec	July	
1451 -	1464	Adam Cant	1452 -	1457	Alexander Napier
June	Mar		July	June	
1464 -	1472/3	Thomas Oliphant	1457 -	1464	William Cranstone
			June	Mar	
			1464 -	1472/3	James Aikman
Mar	July		June	July	
1472/3-	1476	Thomas Simpson of of Knockhill	1475 -	1476	Thomas Yare
July	Aug		July	Aug	
1476 -	1482	George Robinson	1476 -	1477	James Greife

(From 1476, the custumars actual names were not mentioned, but the accounts were rendered by George Robinson, one of the custumars)

Aug	Oct		Aug	Oct	
1482-	1482	Andrew Mowbray	1482-	1482	Laurence Taylor
Oct	Mar		Oct	Mar	
1482	1482/3	Roger Murray	1482	1482/3	Thomas Yare
Mar	Mar				
1482/3-	1487/8	George Robinson			
May	Aug				
1488	1488	Alex. Inglis, archdeacon of St.Andrews			
Aug	Sept				
1488	1493	Thomas Yare			
			July	Oct	
			1489-	1497	George Towers
			July	Sept	
			1489-	1497	James Turing
			Sept	Oct	
			1497	1498	Edward Spittal
Oct	Nov		Oct	Feb	
	1498	Robert Rymde	1498-	1509/10	David Mailville
Nov	Mar				
1498	1499/ 1500	Willian Adamson			
Mar	Dec				
1499/ 1500-	1500	John Adamson			
Mar	Feb				
1499/ 1500-	1509/10	Alex. Lauder			
Dec	Feb				
1500	1509/10	William Adamson			
Feb	Aug		Feb	Aug	
1509/10-	1510	Patrick Paniter	1509/10-	1510	Thomas Dickson
Aug	Jan				
1510	1511/12	Andrew, bishop of Caithness			
	Jan			Jan	
	1511/12	Alex. Lauder		1511/12	George Halkerstone

CLOTH CUSTUMARS OF EDINBURGH

1425-April 1429	George Lauder	Thomas Cranstone April 1429
June 1434-July 1425	John Swift	
July 1435-July 1437	John Barker	
Sept 1437-July 1438	Thomas Preston	
June 1467-July 1468	Andrew Crawford	George Pennycuke

			July			June		July
From Nov 1470		Laurence Taylor	1473	Thomas Yare		1472	Robert Fausde	1473
July 1473-Sept 1482	George Robinson							
Sept 1482-Mar 1482/3	David Crawford			Alex. Gray				
Mar 1482/3-Mar 1487/8	George Robinson							

Cloth receipt were now included in the Accounts of Custumars of Edinburgh

CUSTUMAR OF SALMON AND IMPORTED GOODS AT LEITH

Martinas 1445	Sept 1448	Robert Gray of Leith					
	Dec						
Entry	1452	David Crawford					
Dec 1452	June 1460	Andrew Crawford	(Incl.Woollen Cloth)		Oct 1456	July 1457	James Foulfurde
June 1460	Nov 1461	James Bonkle	George Pennycuke				Francis Knightson
Sept 1462	Sept 1463	Andrew Crawford	Lease under privy seal	£133-6/-			
Sept 1463	June 1467	Andrew Crawford					George Pennycuke

(The above now only accounted for cloth and salt, the receiver of English beer was Thomas Yare)

Entry 1470	June 1472	Andrew Crawford	Alexander Gray		1470 - July 1481		
July 1481	1483	Alexander Gray	David Crawford				
1483-4		David Goldsmith					
July 1484	Aug 1487	David Goldsmith	Oct 1488	James Harelaw	Aug 1486	July 1489	Alexander Gray
Aug 1487	Oct 1488	David Crawford					
Oct 1488	Aug 1492	James Ross	July 1489	June 1491	James Harelaw		
11-16 Oct 1498	- At least 1513	Alexander Crawford					

(When there was no separate account, these receipts were in the main account of the custumar of Edinburgh)

APPENDIX A/1 (e) GALLOWAY

List of Ballivi ad Extra, the length of tenure and arrears accumulated at termination of office. 1450-1513

Name	Duration of Office			Rest at the foot of last account
William, Abbot of Dundrennan	Whitsun 1455	-	13 July 1462	£ 190-8-11
Adam Mure	13 July	-	6 July 1492	£ 735-17-10
James Lindsay of Fairgirth	19 July	-	12 April 1497	£1,377-10-6 (Arrears Account 1502 & 1504)
Edward Spittal	12 April	-	30 July 1498	£ 496-7-6
Mast.Cuthbert Baillie	22 Jan 1498-9	-	27 Jan 1499-1500	£ 74-7-5 (Arrears Account 1501)
David Berton, deputy for the late Robert Lundy of Balgony	Whitsum 1500			
John Dunbar of Mochrum	Whitsun 1500	-	13 July 1502	£ 101-10/-
John Dunbar of Mochrum, son	12 July	-	1 May 1503	No discharge
Sir James Dunbar of Blackcrag				
John Dunbar	1 May 1503	-	16 July 1506	£ 619-12-8
IBID & William McLellan of Bomby	16 July 1506	-	3 Aug 1510	1 £ 903-19-4 (Arrears Account 1512)
				2 £ 520-0-4
Thomas Forrester	16 July 1512		in 1513	£ 117-12-3

APPENDIX A/1 (f) LINLITHGOWSHIRE

James Clerkson	Martinmas 1450	-	12 July 1454	£ 4-13-4
Nicholas Henryson	12 July 1454	-	12 July 1459	£ 64-17-8
Sir Robert Mure	16 March 1460-1	-	22 Feb 1461-2	£ 14-12-4 (Overexpenditure)
John Henryson	Martinmas 1463	-	Whitsun 1464	£ 22-0-0
John Kincaid	22 June 1464	-	3 July 1466	£ 46-16-9 (Arrears Account 1471)
Patrick Johnstone	3 July 1466	-	15 July 1468	£ 166-11-5
Murdoch Hamilton	15 July 1468	-	26 July 1469	£ 25-16-7
Robert Weir	11 July 1470	-	25 June 1471	£ 40-7-8
Sir David Luthirdale	12 June 1472	-	23 July 1478	Eque
Patrick Lyn	23 July 1478	-	29 Aug 1482	£ 37-15-9
Laurence Bertram	6 July 1483	-	2 Aug 1488	£ 193-5-1
William, Lord St.John	2 Aug 1488	-	14 Aug 1495	Eque

James Aitkinhead	14 Aug 1495	-	3 July 1498	£ 141-19-0 (Arrears Account 1499)
Sir Patrick Hume of Polworth	1 Nov 1498	-	8 Mar 1499-1500	Eque
Andrew Crichton	1 May 1502	-	1513	£ 5-13-0

APPENDIX A/1 (g) FIFE

James Paterson	9 Sept 1450	-	26 June 1460	£ 9-18-11 (Overexpenditure)
Michael Balfour	17 Mar 1461-2	-	10 Aug 1463	£ 6-15-8
Thomas Simpson	10 Aug 1463	-	9 Aug 1488	£ 655-17-0
Patrick Hepburn of Denyston	8 Aug 1488	-	7 July 1490	Eque
Sir Thomas Knollis, Vicar of Kilgour	7 July 1490	-	6 July 1492	£ 353-14-11
Mast. William Scott of Flacrag	23 July 1493	-	3 July 1499	£ 200-17-3 (Arrears Account 1501)
Sir Patrick Hume of Polworth	Martinmas 1499			
John Patrick	Whitsum and Martinmas 1500			£ 201-6-11
Sir John Lundy	Whitsum 1501			
	Whitsum 1501	-	12 July 1503	£ 334-0-6 (Arrears Account 1504 & 1505)
David Berton of Creich	1 Nov 1503	-	3 July 1505	£ 440-5-8
James, abbot of Dunfermline (Later James, Archbishop of Glasgow)	3 July 1505	-	1513	£ 220-1-10

APPENDIX A/1 (h) MENTEITH

Sir Thomas Tawse	30 Aug 1450	-	1 Aug 1454	£ 67-5-3
Master Thomas Esok *	16 July 1454	-	8 July 1460	Eque
Sir Robert Mure *	23 Mar 1460-1	-	Martinmas 1463	£ 27-1-9
William Edmonstone of Duntreith	Whitsum 1466	-	9 June 1467	£ 120-17-7
Walter Dog	19 June 1467	-	27 June 1478	Eque
Robert Covyn	27 June 1478	-	22 June 1479	£ 6-13-4
Robert Raa	22 June 1479	-	20 July 1481	£ 27-6-8
Sir Robert Aldcarne	20 July 1481	-	3 Sept 1482	£ 88-17-6
IBID & William Edmonstone of Duntreath	10 July 1483	-	18 July 1485	£ 171-9-0
James Redheuch	18 July 1485	-	Martinmas 1508	£ 8-16-1
(Sir Robert Lundy of Balgony's account acting as Chamberlain 21 Mar 1499-1500 to 20 Mar 1500-1.)				
James Dog	Whitsun 1509	-	27 July 1512	£ 90-6-7

Sir William Edmonstone of Duntreath	31 Aug 1512	-	1513	£ 97-16-0 (Arrears Account 1513)

*Combined Accounts of Strathearn, Menteith and Stirlingshire.

MARCH

Patrick Hepburn of Hailes	Whitsun 1450	-	28 July 1451	£ 677-10-9
Simon Salmon	1 April 1451	-	11 July 1455	£ 40-2-2
Thomas Hume	11 July 1455	-	4 Oct 1456	£ 0-10-1 (Overexpenditure)
Thomas Hume and Simon Salmon	4 Oct 1456	-	11 July 1457	£ 7-6.5
Robert Liddall and Simon Salmon	11 July 1457	-	1 July 1460	£ 213-10-11
Simon Salmon	6 March 1460-1	-	25 June 1466	

(Arrears Account 30 June 1467)

Land gifted to Alexander, earl of March, the brother of James III

IBID	Whitsun 1483	-	1 July 1488	£ 288.15.3
Alexander Hume of that ilk (later Lord Hume)	1 July 1488	-	1513	Eque

APPENDIX A/1 (j) HOLDERS OF OFFICE OF SHERIFF 1455-1501

(ER, vi, 83-109, 140-189, viii, 2-41, xi 301-82
SRO Unprinted Account)

SHERIFFDOM	1455 - 1456	1471	1501
Kincardine	William, Lord Keith	William earl Marischal	
Dumbarton	John Colquhoun of Luss	IBID	Matthew, earl of Lennox
Peebles	David Hay of Lochquhorwart	David Hay of Yestir	John, Lord Hay of Yestir
Clackmannan	Sir William Menteith of Kers	John Menteith	Sir William Menteith of Kers
Perth (infra bungun)	David Flemming		Robert Marsair, Provost of Perth
Argyll	Colin, Lord Campbell	Colin, Earl of Argyle	Archibald, Earl of Argyle
Linlithgow	Archibald Dundas	Sir John Ross of Halkshead	
Berwick	Patrick, Lord Hailes	Adam Hepburn of Dunsyare	Patrick, earl of Bothwell
Roxburgh	Sir Archibald Douglas of Cavers	William Douglas	William Douglas of Cavers
Stirling	James Livingstone	Malcolm Flemming	
Lanark	James, Lord Hamilton	IBID	IBID

SHERIFFDOM	1455 - 1456	1471	1501
RENFREW	Sir Robert Semple of Elliotstone.	Sir William Semple	John, Lord Semple
Fife	Andrew Lundy	IBID	Andrew Lundy
Kinross	James Shaw		Robert Douglas of Loughlewin
Edinburgh	Alexander Ramsey of Dalhousie	William, Lord Crichton	Patrick, Earl of Bothwell
Aberdeen	David, Earl of Crawford	IBID	John, Earl of Crawford
Dumfries	Robert Crichton of Sanquhar	IBID	Robert, Lord Crichton of Sanquhar
Banff	Walter Ogilvy of Deskard	James, Earl of Buchan	Alexander, Earl of Buchan
Ayr	George Campbell of Louden	IBID	Hugh Campbell of Louden
Forfar	Alexander Ogilvy of Othirhouse		Andrew, Lord Gray
Perth	William Murray of Gask	Laurence, Lord Oliphant	William Ruthven, son of Lord Ruthven
Wigton	Andrew Agnew	IBID	John Dunbar of Mouchrum
Selkirk		Thomas, Lord Erskine	Alexander, Lord Erskine
Elgin and Forres		Sir Alexander Dunbar of Westfield	Alexander, Earl of Huntly.
Baillie of Carrick		John Kennedy	David Kennedy
Haddington		James Cockburn of Newbigging	Patrick, Earl of Bothwell
Steward of Kirkcudbright		Hymphray de Colquhoun	IBID
Baillie of Kyle			
Steward of Menteith			Archibald Edmonstone of Duntreath
Steward of Strathearn			John, Lord Drummond
Baillie of Cunningham			Hugh, Lord Montgomery
Inverness			Walter Ogilvy of Bune
Steward of Annandale			John, Lord Maxwell

APPENDIX A/2 DISCHARGES

a) Discharge for the part payment of a composition of ward and marriage, 26 June 1489. (Erroll Charters, No.127).

I Schir Williame of Knowis, comandour off Torfychin, thesaurar to oure sowerance Lorde the kynge, grantis me tille have resavit of the handis of Schir Androw Irlande in the name and apone the behalfe of a nobill and mychty lorde, William erlle of Arrolle, lorde Hay and constabill of Scotlande, the sowme of ane hundretht threscor sex pundis thretten schillingis and four pennyis in part off payment of ane mair sowme quhilk the said lorde is awand to me for the composicioun of the warde and marriagis off the landis and ayris off unquhille Walter Ogstoune of that ilk, efter the forme and tenor of his lettres obligatoris maide to me ther apone. Off the quhilk sowme of ane hundretht threschoir sex pundis thretten schillingis and four pennyis I hald me weill content and pait and assitht and ther off frely quytclaimis, exhonoris and dischargis the said lorde, his ayris, executouris and assignais for our sowerane lorde the kyng, his successouris, and me, myn ayris, executouris and myn assignais now and for ever, be this my present lettres of acquyttance. In wytnes of the qyhilk thing to thir lettres my seill is affixt. At Edinburght, befor thir witnes: Master William Scot of Flaworage, David Strathaquhyne feofar of Thorntoun, James Akynhede, Jhone of Strathaquhone, Jhone Lang and Archibalde Lange, the sex and tuenty day of Junii the yer of God m iiij^{c} auchty and nyn yeris.

b) Discharge for part payment of composition of ward, non-entry and relief, 25 June 1507. (Erroll Charters, No.221. TA, iv, 12)

We James abbot of Denfermline grantis us to have resavit fra William earl of Errole the some of ane hundreth markis usuale monee of Scotland for the composicioun of the ward of the landis of Vaux Byrneis with the myle, and als the soume of threscore lib. in part of payment of the composicioun off the releif and non entree of his landis. Of quhilk somes of j^{c} merkis and lx lib. for the causes forsàid we hald us content and payit and in our soverane lordis name quitclamis and dischargis the said erle and all other tharof for now and ever, be this acquictance, written under our signet at Edinburgh the xxv day of Junii the yeir of God ane throusand five hundreth sevin yeris.

(There was a similar discharge for a further £112-5-5 in part payment of the above relief and non entry, dated 5 July 1508 at Edinburgh.)

c) Discharge for the final payment of a composition of a charter, dated 20 November 1509. (Nat. Lib. Gask Charters, Bundle II, No.24.)

We George, abbot of Arbroath, thesaurar to our soverance lord, grantis ws to have resavit fra Sanderis Forbess, the comptroller and Johnne Watsone, on the behalf of Cristean of Suthirland, the relict of umquhill William Oliphant of Berydale, the soume of thre scoir sex poundis xiijs iiij c. for the composicion of the charter maid to thame of the landis of Strabrock. Of the quhilk soume of lxxj lib. xiijs iiijd. forsiad we hald ws sale content and in our soverane lordis nayme discheargis the said Cristean and all wtheris for evir be this our acquictance. Gevin under our signet Edinburgh, the xx day of November the yeir of God j^{m} v^{c} nyne yeris.

d) Discharge for a composition for a charter of new infeftment, dated 22 May 1512. (Miscellany of Spalding Club, ii, 105-6.)

We, Andro, bischope of Caithnes, come datar of Kelso and Fern and treasourar of our Souerance Lord, grantis us to have ressauit be the handis of Master James Wischart of Pettarowe, the soume of ane hundreth merkis vsuale money off Scotland, in the name and fehalfe of James Arbuthnot of that ilk, in part of payment of ane compasicione for ane new infeftment maid be oure Soverance Lord to the said James, of the barony of Arbuthnot. Off the quhilk soume of ane hundreth merkis, in our saide Soverance Lordis name, we hald us wele content and pait, and the saidis James Arbuthnot his airis, executoris, and assignais theirof dischargis and quittclamis for evir.

e) Discharge for part payment of a composition of a charter of new infeftment dated 17 January 1511-2. (Exchequer, Treasury Precepts and Receipts, Nos.1/6. TA, iv, 156. RMS, ii, 3489.)

I Schire David Grahame of Fyntre knycht ane of the souerteis for the baronys of Angus for the payment of fife thousande merkis to our soverane lord the king and to his thesaurar for the compositionis of thair new infeftmentis of my lord of Angus grantis me til haif resavit fra the handis of Robert Liddail of Panlathy the soume of auchty pundis usual money of Scotland for his composicioun of the landis of Panlathy and the thrid part of Petcumray quhilk he suld haif pait at Mertinmas last bipast as for the last term of the quhilk soume in the main and behalf of our soverance lord and his thesaurar I grant me wele content and payit and grantis ws til get an/

an acquictance of the thesaurar to the said Robert for the said soume. (At Dundee 17 January 1511-2 with an accompanying list of witnesses)

f) Letter of discharge from Sir William Crichton, sheriff of Edinburgh concerning the casualty of relief submitted by David Hay of Yestir, 10 March 1434-5. (Calendar of Yestir Writs, 64)

Be it kende til all men be thir presenter lettrer me William of Crichtoune of that ilk knycht marster off househalde to the king and schirraffe of Edinburght In the Kingis name for to haffe assavit and fullily to haffe hade be the handis off a nobil man dauw the haya of yhester and schiraffe of Peblis lenescoie of pundez twelfe pundez fiftene schillings and foure penysse of usuale mone of Scotlande acht to the king for the ralecffe off the saide david - deliveut in Edinburght for the quhilk forsuth soum off tenscore of pundez twelfe pundez fyfetene schillings and four penysse off all the saide releiffe in the kings name I quitcleme and dischargis the saide david and his airis for ecermore but fraud or gife be thir present lettrez In witness off the quhilk thing to thir presentt lettrez I haffe to sete my seele at Edinburght the X day off marcii the zere of god jmcccc xxxiiii in presens of ser William of Borthwic of that ilk, Robert gray, thomas off lewyntoun and James off chawmer witht mony other.

(Note appended) 'Debet de ista summa vicecomiti novemdecim libras quindecim solidas et quotuor denarios'

g) A discharge by James III to John Lord Darnlie of the entire sum due for his entry to the earldom of Lennox. Dated 31 July 1473.
(Fraser, The Lennox Book, Charter number 67)

James be the grace of God King of Scottis, to all and sindry oure liegis and subditis quhais knaulage thir oure lettres sal cum, greting; Wit ze that foralsmikill as oure louet cousing, Johnne Lord Dernle, has componit with ws for the haile entre in the earldom of Levenex, with the pertinencis liand within oure shireffdome of Striveling and Dumbertane, and we haue gert deliuer to him our brevis thareuppoun, of oure speciale grace and for tendir fauouris that we haue and beiris to oure saide cousing, the quhilk Johne Lord Dernle has made full and haile payment to ws of all and haile sowmez of money and compositiounis tueching the said earldome; We tharefor, for ws and oure successouris, quitclemys the said Johnne Lord Dernle, his aeris, executouris and assignais of all and haile the sowmez of money and compositionis forsaide and haldis ws wele and

an acquictance of the thesaurar to the said Robert for the said soume. (At Dundee 17 January 1511-2 with an accompanying list of witnesses)

f) Letter of discharge from Sir William Crichton, sheriff of Edinburgh concerning the casualty of relief submitted by David Hay of Yestir, 10 March 1434-5. (Calendar of Yestir Writs, 64)

Be it kende til all men be thir presenter lettrer me William of Crichtoune of that ilk knycht marster off household to the king and schirraffe of Edinburght In the Kingis name for to haffe assavit and fullily to haffe hade be the handis off a nobil man dauw the haya of yhester and schiraffe of Peblis lenescoie of pundez twelfe pundez fiftene schillings and foure penysse of usuale mone of Scotlande acht to the king for the ralecffe off the saide david - deliveut in Edinburght for the quhilk forsuth soum off tenscore of pundez twelfe pundez fyfetene schillings and four penysse off all the saide releiffe in the kings name I quitcleme and dischargis the saide david and his airis for ecermore but fraud or gife be thir present lettrez In witness off the quhilk thing to thir presentt lettrez I haffe to sete my seele at Edinburght the X day off marcii the zere of god jmcccc xxxiiii in presens of ser William of Borthwic of that ilk, Robert gray, thomas off lewyntoun and James off chawmer witht mony other.

(Note appended) 'Debet de ista summa vicecomiti novemdecim libras quindecim solidas et quotuor denarios'

g) A discharge by James III to John Lord Darnlie of the entire sum due for his entry to the earldom of Lennox. Dated 31 July 1473.
(Fraser, The Lennox Book, Charter number 67)

James be the grace of God King of Scottis, to all and sindry oure liegis and subditis quhais knaulage thir oure lettres sal cum, greting; Wit ze that foralsmikill as oure louet cousing, Johnne Lord Dernle, has componit with ws for the haile entre in the earldom of Levenex, with the pertinencis liand within oure shireffdome of Striveling and Dumbertane, and we haue gert deliuer to him our brevis thareuppoun, of oure speciale grace and for tendir fauouris that we haue and beiris to oure saide cousing, the quhilk Johne Lord Dernle has made full and haile payment to ws of all and haile sowmez of money and compositiounis tueching the said earldome; We tharefor, for ws and oure successouris, quitclemys the said Johnne Lord Dernle, his aeris, executouris and assignais of all and haile the sowmez of money and compositionis forsaide and haldis ws wele and

thankfully content and pait of the saide soumez, and dischargis him and thame thareof foreuirmar, be thir present lettres. Gevin vndir oure priue sele, at Edinburgh, the last day of the moneth of julii, the zer of our lord a thousand four hundreth seventy and thre zeris, and of oure regnne the thirtene zere.

h) Discharge granted to Henry, abbot of Cambuskenneth, as treasurer, dated 16 August 1495. (Fraser, Cartulary of Cambuskenneth, 31.)

Jacobus Dei gracia rex Scotorum, uniuerisis et singulis ad quorum noticias presentes littere peruenerint, salutem: Sciatis nos recepisse bonum et fidele compotum ac solutionem plenariam a uenerabili in Christo patre nostroque consiliario, Henrico abbate monasterii nostri de Cambuskynneth, de omnibus et singulis pecuniarum summis, compositionibus, wardis, releuiis, maritagiss, extractibus itinerum justiciarie et camerarie, ac vicecomitum et balliuorum curiarum amerciamentiis, ac cartarum, remissionum, infeodationum compositionibus, et de omnibus extractis, proficuis, bonis et intromissionibus, et aliis rebus quibuscunque per eundem uenerabilem in Christo patrim jure fiscali vel fiscali val alias habitis et receptis, ac quomodolibet expositis, omni tempore quo habuit de bobis officium nostre thesaurarie, et de eisdem, vt premittitur, fidele compotum reddidit dominis mostri consilii et clericis per nos ad huiusmodi compotum audiendum et recipiendum limitatis et assignatis; necnon recipimus ab eodem uenerabili patre plenariam et integram deliberationem omnium et singulorum mostrorum jocalium, lapidum preciosorum, ac auri et argenti, monetati et non monetati, et aliorum bonorum nostrorum quorumcunque sibi in custodia commissorum, et per eum receptorum aliquo tempore quo intromisit cum officio nostre thesaurarie predicto; de quibus omnibus et singulis pecuniarum summis, compositionibus, wardis, releuiis, maritagiis, extractibus itinerum justiciarie et camerarie, curiarumque vicecomitum et balliuorum amerciamentis, ac cartarum, remissionum, infeodationum, et aliarum litterarum quarumcunque compositionibus, et de omnibus eschaetis, proficuis et intromissionibus, jure fiscali et alias quauis occasione et quacunque de causa: necnon de omnibus jocalibus, lapidibus preciosis, ac auro et argento, monetato et non monetato, et aliis bonis quibuscunque vsque in diem date presencium tempore preterito, ratione dicti officii thesaurarie per eundem uenerabilem patrem receptiś, habitis, expositis et nobis deliveratis, tenemus nos bene contentos, placatos, as plenarie et fideliter persolutos, et dictum venerabilem patrim suosque successoribus nostris, de omnibus premissis acquietavimus, quittosclamamus, et exoneramus pro perpetuo. In

cuius rei testimonium magnum sigillum nostrum presentibus apponifecimus, apud Striueling, decimo sexto die mensis Augusti anno Domini millesimo auadringentesimo nonagesimo quinto, et regni nostri octauo.

APPENDIX A/3

SUMMONSES AND PROCLAMATIONS OF ANNUAL AUDIT

a) Brieve of summons directed to the sheriff of Aberdeen, dated 1437. (Lord Forbes Papers, No.1.)

Jacobus dei gracia Rex Scotorum vicecomiti et ballivis suis de Abirdene salutem. Quia ordinavimus soaccarium nostrum inchoandum apur Strivelyn octavo die mensis Julii proxime futuri cum continacione dierum, vobis precipimus et mandamus quat enus sitis ibidem die jovis decimo octavo die dicte mensis Julii cum continuacione dierum coram computorum nostrorum auditoribus, prompti et parati ad reddendum computum vestrum, tam de firmis et redditibus nostris quam de wardis, releviis, maritagiis, finibus et eschaetis ac exisibus curie vestre a tempore ultimi compoti redditi de officio vestro, portantes vobiscum extractus itinerum justiciarie et camerarie et omnes et singulos denarios qui nobis debentur de tota ballia vestra, tam de antique financia quam de contribucione concessa ad transitum carissime sororis nostre in Franciam. Insuper premuniri faciatis omnes et singulos burgorum prepositos et ballivos, custumarios magne custume et omnes alios que nobis computa debent per totam balliam vestram et specialiter tam ballivos terrarum nostrarum dominicarum quam intromissores aliarum terrarum nostrarum racione warde vel alias quod dictis die et loco personaliter intersint compota sua finaliter reddituri et quod secum deferant omnes et singulos denarios de eorum officiis nobis debitos quorum termini sunt vel tunc erunt elapsi. Et vos vicecomes habeatis vobiscum dicto die premunicionis vestre testimonium et hoc breve. Et hoc usb pena que competit in hac parte nullattenus omitatis. Datum sub testimonio magni sigilli nostri apud Strevelyn decimo tercio die mensis Maii anno regni nostri primo,

APPENDIX A/3

b) PROCLAMATION OF THE EXCHEQUER, dated 1506. (ADC, xviii, f 196.)

We do yow to witt, it is thocht expedient, avisit and concordit be oure soverance lord and his lordis of counsale that his chekker be haldin in Edinburgh and begyn the day of Junii nixt tocum witht continuacioun. Quharefore we charge straitly and commandis in oure soverance lordis naim all his officaris, liegis and subditis that aw compt in the said chekkir that thai compere before the lordis auditouris therof the said xv day of Junii witht continacioun of dais to give compt, reknyn and payment of all dewitez awin of termes bigane sen ther last compt efter the tenore of the preceptis to be direct therapoun under all pane and charge that efter may follow.

APPENDIX A/3

c) Proclamation against those failing to account in the Exchequer, dated 1503. (ADC, xiv, f 177.)

We do yow to wit, forsamekill as the auditouris of our chekker has remanit and sittin in this toune attours the latter day of the chekker apoun the comptis of chaumerlanis, schireffis, custumaris, bailyes of burrowis and stewartis, malaris, fermoraris and all utheris officiaris that aw compt to our chekker, nevertheless the maste part of the said officiaris that aucht compt are nocht comperit and ane other part comperit and has part comperit and has past away, unendit thair comptis, and comptempnandly has dissobeyt, nocht dredand the panis contenit in our preceptis and letterez past apoun thame. Herefore we charge all and sindry our said chaumerlanis, schireffis, stewartis, bailyeis, balyeis of burrowis, custumaris, fermoraris and takismen and all other oure officiaris quhilkis aw to us compt that thai compete on Monenday nixt tocum witht continuacioun of dais before the auditouris of chekker, and thair the saidis persons that has enterit thair comptis to red and end the sammyn finaly, and tha that has nocht comperit as yit, that thai compere and enter thair said comptis and mak finaly red and payment of the sammyn, undir the pane of tynsale of ther officicis, alswele to thaim that had the sammyn in heritage as othir wais, and of tynsale of takkis of quhatsumevir lorchschippis to the takkismen and fermoraris that aw compt, and apprising of thair gudis and landis for the hale soumez restand apoun thaim in oure rollis, with certificatioun to all that dissobeis this present charge that the panis foresaid albe execute apoun thaim bot ony delay or favouis.

James R.

APPENDIX A/4 ROYAL WARRANTS AND PRECEPTS FOR PAYMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

a) Letter from James III to the auditors of the Exchequer confirming the legality of annual pensions to David, earl of Crawford. (ER, ix, 227.)

Rex. Auditouris of oure checker: It is oure will and we charge yow that ye allow and put in oure rollis of compt to the custumaris ballies of oure burowis of Abirdene, Montrose, and Forfare, the heritable yerely pensionis that oure traest cousing and counsaloure David erle of Craufurde, maister of our household, and his predecessouris has raisit and tane of oure custuys and malez of oure saide burowis in tymes bigane, making mensioun in oure saide rollis of the heritable sesing taking be oure said cousing of the saide yerely pensionis. Gevin under oure signet at Edinburgh the secund day of July anno Domini etc., LXXXIII°.

APPENDIX A/4

b) Letter of assignation of pension to James Hommyl directed to the chamberlain of Stirlingshire, dated 20 January 1477-8. (ER, ix, 93-4.)

James be the grace of God King of Scottis, to oure chawmerlane of Strivelineschire that now is and that sall happin to be for the tyme greting. Wit ye that we now being in oure perfyt aige and efter oure last generale revovacioun for the singular favour that we have to oure familiar servitur and werkman for oure persoun James Hommyll, we have genin and assignit and be thir oure lettrex gevis and assignis to him a yerly pensioun of twenty pundis of usuale money of oure realme for all the dais of his life for his lele trew and thankfull service done and to be done to ws, to be pait to the said James yerly of the malis and proffittis pertening to ws within Strivelineschire to oure chaumerlain therof that now is and sall happin to be for the tyme, at two usuale termes in the yere Witsonday and Mertimes in wyntir be evin porcionis, but ony revocacioun impediment or againcalling of ws or oure succesouris quhatumevir induring the lyf tyme of the said James. Quharfore we charge straitle and commandis you oure said chaumerlane that now is and sall happin to be for the tyme, that ye yerly content and pay to the said James at the termes forsaid the said soume of twenty pundis in his fie for all the dayis of his life yerly of oure said malis and fermes of Strivelineschire, nochtwithstanding oure said last generale revocacioun, under all the hiest pain and charge that efter may folou. The quhilk soume of twenty pundis we sall mak be wele allowit to you yerly in your

comptis be the auditouris of oure chekker, ye schewand thir oure lettres anys before the saidis autitouris and registrit in oure chekker rollis and bringing the said James acuittance and ressait of the said soume yerly to scheu for your warant, and thir oure lettres being registrit, deliveris thame again to the said James to remain with him all the dais of his lyfe as said is. Gevin undir oure Prive Sele at Edinburgh the twenty day of Januar the yere of oure Lord a thousand foure hundreth sevinty and sevin yeris and of oure genne the auchtene yere.

c) Royal precept for the allowance of the arrears of George Robinson, custumar of Edinburgh, dated 23 July 1483. (ER, ix, 218-9.)

Rex. Audtiouris of oure chekker; we charge yow that ye allow and discharge to oure servitour George Robinsoun of the last rest of his compt of oure custumys of Edinburgh before this oure chekker the soume of a thousand and auchtene pundis, quhilkis he paid and deliverit of oure commande as eftir followis and yit restis apon him in oure chekker rollis undiffesit; in the first, vij li to the costis of the nunnys of Halistane; to Gelicane, the Papis messinger, xx li; to David Goldsmyth, for the ekin of a chenye of ouris, two unce of gold, xiiij li; to Thomas Prestour quhen he past in Orkinnay for the hame bringin of the schip with wyne, lxxx li. Alsua for the biggin of twa roll bargis of ouris and graith that the said George bocht and expensis tht he made tharapon, iiij^{c}xxxvj li. And for expensis made be him of oure command in a hunder and aucht wall of irne to the makin of serpentynis and gunnys, ij^{c}xiiij li. iiijs. And to ane Ireland man, x li. ressavit fra the said Georg be Rob Raa. Alsua for the payment made to the werkmen that wrocht the blac money of oure command, j^{c}lxxx li. xvjs. Of the quhilk sojmez abovewrittin we have gert se and examyn the saide Georgis compt particulary. And attour that ye allwo to the saide George j^{c}xlvj li. that he had in keping of ouris and that was takin fra him at Lawdre and withhaldin be Alexander Lawire, of the quhilk we will have the saide George dischargit and the said Alexander callit to mak ws payment tharof. Gevin under oure signet and subscripcioun mannuall at Edinburgh the xxiij day of July and of oure regne the xxiij yere.

APPENDIX A/5 JUDICIAL DECREES CONCERNING FINANCIAL MATTERS

a) Decree concerning the bond of the lessee of Ettrick Forest for the rests of his account, dated 7 September 1503. (ADC, xiv, f 186. ER, xii, 116).

In presens of the lordis auditouris of chekker Alexander lord Hume oblist him to content and pay to Johne of Striveling comptrollare the soume of jcliiij li. betuix this and Mertimes nixt tocum undir the pane of doubill to the King, because the said comptrollare tuke the sammyn apoun him as payment of the sald Alexanderis rest of his compt of the Forest etc. to the payment of the quhilk soume of ane hundretht fifti foure fundis he band cc him in the sikkerest form.

b) Decree concerning the relief of the sheriff of Aberdeen at the hands of his depute, dated 27 May 1503. (ADC, xiv, f 158)

In the accioun adn caus persewit on the behalf of oure soverance lord be Johnne erll of Craufurd schiref principale of Abirdene one that ane part aganis Alexander Banerman of Wattertoun his deput in that said office of schireffschip of Abirdene on that uthir part, to heire and se him self decernit to mak payment to oure soverane lord of the soume viij c and foure score of li. with the maire usuale money of the realm restand one the said Alexander in the chekkar rollis of wardis, releffis and extretis of justice airis of Abirdene intromettit with be him, and his landis and gudis to be prisit thairfor to the releifing of the said Johnne erll of Crawfurd principall schireff forsiad of the sammyn at the nandis of oure soverane lord, as at mair lynth is contenit in the summondis maid thairupoun. The said Johnne erl of Crawfurd being personaly present, the said Alexander Banerman being lauchfully summond to ansueir in this mater becaus it concernis oure soverane lord, nochtwithstanding the generall continuacioun maid of all summondis to the nixt sessioun, oft tymes callit and nocht comperit, the rychtis, resouns and allegaciouns of the said Johnne erl of Craufurd at lynth sene, hard and undirstandin, the lordis thairwith ryplie avisit decreities and deliveris for ocht thai have yit sene, that the said Alexander Banerman sall freith, releif and keip the said Johnne erll of Crawfurd principall schireff forsaid harmles and scaithles at oure soverance lordis handis of the said payment of the said soume of aucht hundreth and foure score of li. usuale money forsaid restand one him of wardis, releiffis, extretis of justic airis and uther casualiteis within the schirefdome of Abirdene intromettit with be the said Alexander, as the fute of his compt of the said office genin be him

at Edinburgh the xvj day of August the yeir of God v^{c} and ij yeire, extract furth of the chekkar róllis be the hand of Master Gawin Dunbar clerk of the register and rollis undit his signe and subscripcioun manuale, schawis and producit befor the said lordis proportis, as he the said Alexander that exercit the said office as deput forsaid and intromettit with the said casualteis and enterit the compt thairof and is bund and oblist to releif and keip the said Johnne erl of Craufurd principall schireff of Abirdene harmeless and scaithless of the sammun at oure soverane lordis handis, as ses sufficientlie previt be the said Alexanderis letterex obigatouris undir his seile and subscripcioun manuall maid to the said Johne thairupoun inlikwis schawin and producit befor the saidis lordis, and ordanis oure soverance lordis to be derect to distrenye the aid Alexander, his landis and gudis thairfor and for xls. of unlaw to be inbrocht to the clerk of register to the expensis of the lordis becaus the said Alexander tynt his actioun.

c) Judicial proceedings concerning a dispute over the gift of the escheat of the goods of Donald McGill, dated 20 July 1498. (ADC, ii, 284-5)

Anent the command gevin be the Lordis of Consale to Alexander Gordon, stewart deput of Kirkcubricht, and William McClelane, son and apperand aire til Thomas McClelane of Bondby, til compere before the Lordis of oure soverane Lordis Chekker til produce thare richtis belangin the eschete of gudis of unquhile Donald McGill, quhilk was justerfyit in the stewart court of Kirkcudbricht, like as is at mare lenth contenit in the sammyn; The sade Wilyeame being personaly present, and the sade Alexander being oftymes callit and nocht comperit, it was allegit be the sade Wilyeam that our soverane Lord had gevin til him the eschete gudis of the sade Donald, and thareapone producit ane letter of gift of the sammyn under the Kingis signer; and als the said Alexander allegit of before the Lordis of Consale that he had componit with Georg, abbot of Paslay, our soverane Lordis Thesaurare for the tyme, for the eschete gudis of the sade Donald for xl s, and thareapone producit ane writing subscrivit with the said Thesauraris handis and tharethrow circumvenit him in the sammyn; this allegacions herd, sene, understand and being tharewith riplie avisit, the Lordis of Chekker decretis and decernis baith the sade gift made to the said Wilyeam and the composicions made be the sade Alexander with the sade Thesaurare til be of nane availe, force nor effect in tyme tocum, because the sade gift made to the sade Wilyeam was under the Kingis signet quhare it suld haf bene under his privie sele, and als that the composicione made be the sade Thesaurare to the said Alexander for xl s be circumvensione of him nocht schawand the

verite thareof, howbeit the sadis eschete gudis war worth xxvij li., the composicion of the sammyn being for xl x, as sade is, and als the Thesaurare subscrivand the sade composicioun and nane utheris contenit in the commissione grantit til him of the sammyn; and that tharfore the sadis gudis ar in the handis of our soverane Lord til be disponit be him or his Thesaurare to quhat persone or persons thai plese; and ordanis our sovarane Lordis letters be direct tharapone.

d) Judicial proceedings undertaken by the king over the failure of lord Ruthven sheriff of Perth to submit a sum to money to the crown, dated 31 March 1497. (ADC, ii, 69-70.)

Anent the actioun and cause persewit on behalff of oure soverane Lord aganis Wilzam, Lord Rothven, schiref of Perth, for the wranguis detentioun and withhalding fra his Hienes of the soume of ij^{c} li. usual money of Scotland restand awing to hime in the chekker rollis, quhilk soume of ij^{c}li. oure soverane Lord has assignit and gevin to ane venerable faider in God, Henry, Abbot of Cambuskynneth, for the outred and payment to be maid for certane stuff and merchandise takin be him to our soverance Lordis use the tyme he wes his Thesaurare, lik as is contenit in the copy of the said chekker rollis extract be the handis of Henry Mare and subscrivit with our said soverane Lordis hand and the Lordis Auditouris of the Chekker, schewin and producit before the Lords; The saidis Lordis of Consale thairwith beand repely avisit, decrettis and deliveris that the said Wilzame, lord Rothven, schiref of Perth forsaid, sall content and pay to the said venerable faider the said soume of ij^{c} li. usuale money forsaid, for the outred and payment of our soverane Lordis dettis, as said is, nochtwithstanding ony defesaunce or discharge genin to the schiref thairapoun sen the said soume wes assignit to the said venerable faider, for the Kingis hienes had declarit that he gaif never discharge nor his mynd wes never to gif na defesaunce nor discharge thairof; and ordinis our soverane Lordis letters to direct to compell and distrenze the said Wilzame his landis and gudis thairfore; and he wes summond to this actioun oft tymes callit, and nocht comperit.

e) Action sir Baldred Blackadder against the comptroller over the latter's failure to pay his pension, dated 6 February 1499-1500. (ADC, ii, 379.)

The Lordis of Consale decretis and eliveris that for ocht thai haf yit sene, Maister Hew Martin, that tyme Comptrollar til our soverane Lord, sal content and pay till Schir Baldred Blacader, knycht, the soume of twenti merkis usuale money of Scotland aucht til him for his fee, quhilk was allowit til him in the Chekker rollis, efter the tenor of the copy of the sade Chekker rollis extract be the hand of Maister Richard Robsone under his subscripcione mannuale schawin and producit before the Lordis.

f) Complaint by the comptroller over the failure of lord Kennedy to submit the farms from Arran, dated 31 January 1496-7. (ADC, ii, 62.)

Anent the complaynt made be Schir Duncane Forester of Skippinch, knicht, comptrollare to oure soverane Lord, apone Jhone, Lord Kennedy, for the wrangus detencione and withhalding fra him of the soume of lxxx li. aucht to him for the malis of Arane, that he suld haf payit to the sade Schir Duncane efter the tenor of his obligacione at this last Mertymes terme, like as is at maire lenth contenit in the complaynt thareuppone; Baith the saidis partiis being personaly present, thare richtis, ressons and allegacions being herd, sene and understand, the Lordis of Consale decretis and deliveris that the sade Jhone, lord Kennedy, sal content and pay to the sade Schir Duncane Forester in the Kingis name the sade soume of fourescore of pundis usuale money of the realme for the malis of the saidis landis of Arane, efter the forme of his obigacione schawin and producit before the Lordis, reservand to the sade Jhone, Lord Kennedy, his accione aganis Wilzeame, Lord of Sanct Jhons, to call quhame before he plesis; and ordanis our soverane Lordis letters be direct to compell and distrinze the sade Jhone, Lord Kennedy, his landis and gudis tharfore.

APPENDIX A/6 FEUDAL CASUALTIES

a) Retour of Duncan Grant as heir of Gilbert of Glencharny, is grandfather in the lands of Connygais, dated 7 February 1468.
Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, iii, 28-9.

Hec inquisido facta fuit apud Inuernys septimo die mensis Februcini anno Domini millismo quadringentesimo sexagesimo octabo coram celestino de insulis deputato viceccinte de Inveruys, per hoc fidelos subcriptos, videlicet, Allexandrum de Suthirland de Duffus, Wilelmun de Wrcharde de Crommody, militem, Hugonem Rosse de Kulrawac, Tomam Cumin de Altre Johannem Monroy de Foulis, Johannem Haye, de Malie, Davit Waltersum, de Kyncardin, Allexandrum Coming Irnyside, Allexandrum Forbes, Johannem Fauconare de Murtholme, Patricium Feirgussun de Invernys, Willelmum Hughunsum, Alexandrum Ross, Donaldum Andersun, Henricum Fraser Gilbertom Fynlausun, Ewin Achlek, Hygonem Monroy, et Cristinum Taylzure: Qui iurati dicunt , quod eondam Gilbertos de Glencharny cuius donucany de Graunt, mylitis, latoris presencium obbiet ultimo vestitus et sasitus ut de feodo, ad pacem et fidem domini nostri legis, de terris de cunygass cum pertinenciis iacentibus infra dictum vicecomtatum de Inveruys : et quod dictus Donuconces est legitimus et propinquior heres dicti condam Gilberti aui sui de dictis terris cum pertinenciis ; et quod legitime etatis : Et quod dicte terre walent nune per annum xls : et quod valuenint tempore pacis decem maicis: Et quod dicte terre nune sunt in manibus domini nostri Regis : et tenentur in capite de domini nostro Rege per wadam et relevium : et nume existunt in manibus domini nostri Regis in defectu ven herdis ius suum non prosequentis a tempore obitus dieti Gilberti, qui obbiit trigenta annys elapsis vel excirca: In inquisicionis testimonium sigilla eorundam qui dicte inquisicioni intererant sunt appensa : clausum sub sigille dicti celestini, wiceccinitis deputati supradicti.

b) Royal Gift of Ward and Marriage to William Douglas, son of Archibald, fifth Earl of Angus, dated 29 September 1492. (Fraser, Douglas Book iii, 136-7.)

James, be the grace of God King of Scottis, to all and sindri our liegis and subditis quham it efferis quhao knowleage thir oure lettres salcum, greting : Wit yhe ws to have gevin and grantit, and be thir oure lettres gevis and grantis to oure louit cosing Williame Douglas, sonne to oure traist and welebelouit cosing and conselloure, Archibald erle of Angus, the warde of all and sindry the landis, rentis and possessiouns, being in oure handis be ressain of warde be the deceis of James Auchinlek,

unquhile sonne u air to Johnne Auchinlek of the ilk, knyche, quharesumever thai be within oure realme, for all the tyme of the warde therof, togeddir with the mariage of Elizabethe Auchinlek the dochter and air of umquhile the said James, and ayr to the said Johnne; and falexeant that the said Wilkanve decisis or disassentis to mary the said Elizabetht, we geif and grantis, be thir oure lettres, the mariage of the said Elizabetht to our saw cosing and consellour, Archibald erle of Angus and and his assignous ane or maa. : and falexeand that the said Elizabetht decis unmariit, the mariage of the air or airis, sonnis or dochteris, that sall happin to succeid to the said unquhile James Auchinlek and Johnnes Auchinlekis heretage quhatsumerir : to be haldin and to be had, the saidis warde and mariage, to the saidis Williameand Archibald in all thingis, like as is abone writtin, with all commoditeis, fiedomes, proffictis,asementis and richtwis pertinence quhatsumever pertenying or richtwisly may pertene to the said warde and mariage, and fiely to dispone therapoun to there utilite and proffict, as thai think maist expedient, buy ony impediment, obstakle, or agriecalling quhatsumever: Quharefae we charge strateke and commandis zow, all and sindri oure liegis and subditis foresaidis, that ze, and ilkane of zow, raddily intend, ansver and obey to our said cousingis Williame Douglas and Archibald erle of Angus, and his assignais, ane or mea, in all and sindry thingis concernyng the said warde and mariagez, and the proffictis thereof, under all the hiest pane, charge and offence that ze, and ilkane of zow, may committ and inrin agane oure Maieste in that parte. Gevin under oure Privie Sele, at Cowper, the penult day of September, the zere of God 1^{m}, iii^{c}, Lxxxxii zeris and of oure regnne the fyfre zere.

James R.

c) Decree of recognition against John Stirling of Keir, dated 12 May 1513. (Fraser, The Stirlings of Keir, 298)

At Edinburgh, the xii day of Maii, the zer of God $1^{m}v^{c}$ and xiii zeris; the Lords of Counsale underwrittin, that is to say, ane maist reverend fader in God, James Archebischop of Glasgw, ane noble and mychty lord, William lord Bothuik, Maister Gawine Dunbar archedene of Sanctandrois, Clerk of the Registre, Williame Scot of Baluerye knycht, and Robert Coluile of Vchiltre; decretis and deliueris that Schir Johnne Striueling of the Keir, knycht, and all utheris, havand or traistand to have interes to the landis of Lupno, Dauchlewan and Raterne Striueling, uthire wayis callit the Cogis of Straithalloun has tynt thar propirte and possessioun thareof, and decernis the samyn to pertene to oure soverane Lord, and to be disponit at

his plesoure, as his propire landis in tyme to cum; Because the maist part of the saidis landis is analyt without licence, consent, or confirmatioun of oure said soverance Lord or his predicessouris, thai beand haldin of his Hienes immediately, be seruice of warde and releif; and nochtwithstanding the Chartoure of annexatione under the gret seile producit be the said Schire Johnne Striueling; because the said alienatioun wes maid before the said annexatioun, as wes undirstand to the saidis Lordis. For the quhilk cause of alienatioun, the saidis landis war recognisit in oure soverane Lordis handis and nocht lattin to borch the space of zer and day efter the said recognitioun being bipast. Our soverance Lord comperand be Maister James Henrisoune his advocat; the said Schir Johnne being personaly present, and al utheris havand interes being summond oftimes callit and nocht comperit. Extractum de libro actorum per me Magistrum Gawinum Dunbar Archidiaconum Sanctiandree, Clericum Retulorum Registri ac Consilii S.D.N. Regis sub meis signo et subcriptione manualibus.

Gawinus Dunbar.

d) Decree of Privy Council concerning the non-entry of Archibald, Earl of Angus to the lands of Kirriemuir, dated 17 June 1510. (Fraser, Douglas Book, iii, 144-5.)

At Edinburgh, the xvii day of Junii, the zeir of God $1^{m}V^{c}$ and tene zeiris, the Lordis of Counsale under written .....anent the summondis maid at the instance of our soverane lord aganis Archibald erle of Angus, berand him tenent to his Hienes, of the landis and barony of Kenmur with the pertinentis (and other named lands)------ within the Schriefdome of Forfaire, and aganis all utheris havand interes to the saidis landis, to heir and se the sammyn decernit to haif bene in our Soverance Lordis handis and his predecessouris, be the space of xlv zeiris last, by post, be ressoun of nonentres, and to bring with thame sic charteris and evidentis as thai will use in the said mater ilk as at nair lenth is contenit in the said summondis, our soverance Lord comperand by Master James Henrisoune, his advocat, and the said Erle of Angus being personalie presente, and diveris utheris fie tenentis of the saidis and landis and barony comperand and schawand na lauchfull interes, and ane uthir part being lauchfullie summond to this actioun, oftymes callit and nocht compout, the partiis, punctis, nychtis, ressonis and allegationis had, sene and understand, and thairwitht being riplie avisit, the Lordis of Counsale decietis and deliveris that the saidis landis and barony of Kenmure, witht the remanent of the

landis, mylns and fircheingis before expiernit, hes bene in oure soverane Lordis handis derrest faderis, quhom God assofie be the said space of xlv reins, be ressoune of noventres, because the said Archibald erle of Angus grantit in judgement, that he was not lauchfulle enteirt thairto be the said space, and thairfor decernis the byrun mailles thairof, extending zierlie to the soume of ane thousand pundis usual money of Scotland, to pertene to our soverane Lord be the said space, and the lands to remane with his Hienes, ay and quhill the payment thairof, and quhill the samyn be lauchfulle recovert fra him as efferis and that lettres be duect to appris the saidis landis and barony forsaid for the said soume zierlie be the forenemmyt space, to remane with our said soverane Lord as said is, gif neid bais.

(1st August 1510 Charter of new infeftment of barony to the earl of Angus (Fraser, Douglas Book, iii, 195-6)).

e) Precept to the sheriff of Aberdeen to levy the non-entry and relief of of the lands of Esslemont, dated 13 November 1495. (Erroll charters, No.144).

James br the grace of Gode, king of Scottis, to oure schiref of Abirdene and his deputis, greting. Forasmekle as the landis of Essilmond, Arnage and the Chapelton witht the pertinencis has bene and yit ar in oure handis sen the deceiss of unquhile Henry Chene of Essilmond, extending to thre termes, be the nonentres of the rychtwis air therto. Our will is herefore and we charge yow straitly and commandis that ye incontinent thir our lettrez sone pas to the saidis landis and rais and inbringto ws the relief and the sammyn, extending to four score of pundis, togidder witht the saidis thr termez males, extending to sex score of pundis, as ye will ansuer to us therapon and under all pane and charge that after may follow. Gevin under our signet at Edinburgh the xiij day of November and of our regne the viij yere.

f) Alienation of property on account of the failure of the earl of Rothes to pay a composition for the non-entry of the barony of Balmain, dated 13 May 1510. (RMS, ii, 3460).

Rex, pro bono servitio, et ex speciali favore, concessit familiari suo militi Johanni Ramsey de Terrenzeane, et ejus heredibus, - terras et baroniam de Balmane, que fuerunt quondam Geo. Lesly predecessoris Geo. com. de Rothes, cum annexis earundem, Balmane, Esly, Westir Strathe, molendinum

de Fethircarne, annum redditum de Fethircarne; quas Jonete Keith domina Innermeth possidebat; terras de Maurtis, Petnenane, molendinum de Kincarde, molendinum fullonum de Petnamone, Dorynch, Mure, le Quhitfeild, quas Geo. Leslie de Petnamone possedebat, et terras de Fesky, quas Walter Lesly de Fesky possedebat prius de barone de Balmane; cum omnibus aliss dependen. dicte baronie, vic. Kincardin:- quas quondam Eufamea Leslie filia et heres quondam Alexandri com. de Ros in manibus quondam Rob. ducis Albanie, tanquam gubernatoris Scotie resignavit, et quas idem Rob. iterum donavit dicte Eufamea et heredibus ejus de corpore legitime procreandis, quibus deficientibus, Johanni Stewart, comiti Buchane et ejus heredibus cui rex fuit legitime et propinquior heres;- et per concilii dominos decretum est quod dicta baronia in manibus regis fuit tanquam superioris ratione nonintroitus heredis, a tempore decessum quondam Georgii Leslie progenitoris dicti dom. de Rothes, usque ad mortem quondam Alexandri com. de Insulis, pretensi com. de Ros, et a tempore introitus Johannis de Insulis, filii dicti Alex., etiam pretensi com. de Ros usque ad forisfacturam dicti Johanni; quo tempora continent in integro spatium 26 annorum, pro quo tempore proficua dicte baronie extenderunt at 2210 libras, pro qua summa dicte terre appreciate fuerunt et regi assignate, et quas terras rex de novo incorporavit in baroniam de Balmane.

g) Charter of new infeftment to Alexander, lord Hume following the recognition of the lands of Thortnton, dated 15 May 1494. (Biel Muniments, 6).

Jacobus dei gratia rex Scotorum. Omnibus probis himinibus tocius terre sue clericis et laicis salutem. Sciatis nos tanquam senescallum Scotie dedisse concessisse et hac presenti carta nostra confirmasse dilecto consanguineo et conciliario nostro Alexandro domino Hume, magno camerario meo omnes et singulas terras de Thornetoun le duas Akyngallis Crechnowis and Monynet cum capitali, messuagio fortalicio et molendino earundem de omens annos redditus et alias pertinentiis eisdem terris pertinentes jacentes infra vicecomitatum nostrum de Renfrew. Quequidem terre cum capitali messuagio fortalicio molendino annuis redditibus et aliis pertinentibus nunc ad manus nostrae devenerunt et nobis pertinent ratione eschaete et forisfacture per alienacionem factam de tota et integra renandria dictarum terrarum per Johannem Montgunry olim tenentem et possessorem earundem Alison Hammyltoun filie quondam Archibaldi Hammyltoun de Innerwik simitis et certis aliis personis absque consensu nostri aut predecessorum nostrorum tanquam senescallorum Scotie superiorum immediatorum arundme desuper optentis et habitis. Tenendi et habendi omnes et singulas predictas terras de Throneton, le duas Akyngallis

Crechnowis et Monynet cum capitali messagio fortalicio et molendino earundi ac omnes annuos redditus et alias pertinentiis eisdem terris pertinentes dicto Alexandro domino Hume hereditibus suis et assignatis de nobis et succesoribus nostris senscallis Scotie infeodo et hereditate imperpetuum per omnes rectas, metas suas antiquas et divisas jacentes in longetudine et latitudine in boscis planis moris meresiis, viis, semitis, aquis, stagnis, rivolis, pratis, pascuis et pastiris molendinis multiris et eorum sequelis aucupacionibus venacionibus piscationibus petariis turbariis carbonariis, lapicidiiis lapide et calce fabrilibus brasinis, brueriis et genestis cum curiis et earun exitibus herezeldis bludewitis et merchetis mulierum cum wraik wash and ware ac cum omnibus aliis et singulis libertatibus commoditatibus et asiamentis ac justis pertainentes suis quibuscumque tam non nominatis quam nominatis tan subtus terra quam supra terram procul et prope ad predictas terras capitale messagium fortalium et molendinum earundem annuos redditus et alias pertinentiis eisdem pertinentes spectantibus seu juste spectare valentibus quomodolibet in futurum adeo libere quiete plenarie, integre honorifice bene et in pace in omnibus et per omnia sicut dictus Johannes Montgumry aut aliqui predecessorum suorum predictas terras capitale, messuagium fortalitium molendinum annuos redditus et alias pertintias de nobis aut predecessoribus nostris senscallis Scotie ante predictam alienacionem de eisdem factam liberius tenuit es seu possedit tenuerunt seu possearunt. In cuius Rei testimonium presenti carte nostre magni sigillum nostrum apponi precepimus. Testibus reverendissimo in episcopo patre Roberto Archiepiscopo Glasguensis dilectis consanguineis nostris Archibaldo comite Angusie domino Dowglas cancellario nostro patricio comite de Boithuil domino Halis Roberto domino Lile, Johanne domino Glammis, justiciariis nostris Andrea domino Gray magno hospicii nostri venerabilisus in patribus George abbate de Dunfermling Henrico abbate de Cambuskynet thesaurario nostro et dilectis clericis nostris magistris Recardo Murehede deano Glasguensis secretario nostro Johanne Fresale decano de Lestalrig nostrorum rotulorum et registri ac concilii clerico. Apud Glasgw decimo quinto die mensis maii Anno dominii Millesimo quadringentesimo nonagesimoquarto et Regni nostri sexto.

APPENDIX A/7 PROFITS FROM JUSTICE

a) Indenture betwixt Sir Robert Lundy of Balgony, Treasurer to the king and George Master of Angus, for keeping good order on the borders, 17 April 1499 (Fraser, The Douglas Book, iii, No.151)

Thir Indenturis, made at Edinburgh the xvii day of Aprile, the zere of Gode 1m 1111c nynty and nyne zeris propertis contenis and baris witnes, that, for the gud revle to be had amangis our soverone Lordis liegis duelland and remanand wythin the boundis of Eskdale, Ewisdale, and Wauchopdale, on the vest Bordouris and stanchinge of ermies and offensis to be committit be thame in tyme to cum, it is appunctit and concodit betwix Robert Lundy of Balgony, knycht, Thesaurare to our soverane Lord, in his name and behalf on the ta part, and George Mastyr of Angus on the tuther part, in maner, forme and effect as eftir folowis: that is to say, that for samekle as the Kyngis Heres has grantit and gewud his fie remissione and pardoun tyll all maner of personis duelland and remanand wyhtin the saidis boundis of Eskdale, Ewisdale and Wauchopdale, for all maner of actionis transgressiones, crimes, and offensis committit and doune be thame of ony ane of thame in ony tyme bigane, and to the day of the date of the makyne of thir indenturis, tressoune in oure soverane lordis propir person except heirfor the said George Master of Angus sal content and pay to the said Robert Lundy of Balgony, in our saide soverane Lordis name, the swme of a thousande pundes usual money of Scotland at thir termes underwritin: that is to say twenty days next before Fest of ad vincula Sancti Petor, callit Lammas immediate folowand the date of thir indenturis, fywe hundrethe merkis of the said swm and wythin xv dais next and immediate folowand the said Fest of Lammas uthir five hundrethe of the said money : the quhilk some of a thousand merkis being completle pait at the termes abonewritus, the said George Mastyr of Anguse to be dischargit of the sais hayle sume of a thousand pundis : and gif the said George Mastir of Angus failias in the payment of the said some of a thousande merkis, or ony part tharof, at the termes forsaid, than he sal pay the said hayle sume of a thousand pundis at the said term of xv dias next efter the saide Fest of Lammas, as said is: and for the stanching of crimes and terspassis of the personis duelland and remanand wythin theboundis abwin expremit in tyme to cum, the saide George Mastir of Anguse for hym is becummyn and, be thir present indenturis becumis lawborois for ilk persone remanand and dwelland wythin the said boundis of Eskdale, Ewisdale and Wauchopdale, and bindis and oblisis him to entre thame and ilk ane of thame in the Justice to be haldin at the burgh of Drumfreis, to underly the law for quhetsumever crimes and trespassis to be committit be thame in tymes to cum. .....being gyffid

to the said George Master of Angus be the Justice Clerk or his deputis in portwis, xv dias befor holding of the said justice airis, under the pane of law for ilk ane of the saide personis that comperis nocht as oft as the Kyngis Heries plese to set, proclame, and hold justice airis at the burgh of Drumfreis in tyme to cum, and als lange as the saidis landis pertane to the said George in heritage, and that the personis duelland wythin the saidis boundis quhilkis sal tak remissione be wirtu of this indenture and compens in justice airis forsaid sal fynd suirte for satifactione of party al crimes sew the Fest of Sanct Andro in wyntyr, in the zeire of God $1^{m}111^{c}$ nynty and sevin zeris alanerly; to the observing, kepyng and fulfillyng of al and syndry the thyngis abone writin, the said Robert Lundy of Balgony knycht, in the name and behalf of our soverance Lord, hes bundin and oblist him, and in likwis the said George Mastir of Angus has bundin and oblist hym, his airis, executouris and assignais, his and thar landis rentis, possessiounis and gudis, movible and unmovible, has and to be had, quharsumever thai be wythin the realme of Scotland, but fraud or gyle: in witnes herof, to the part of thir indenturis remanand wyth our said soverane Lord, the said George Master of Angus has afficit his seyle and subscrivit the same wyth his awin hand and to the part of the said indenturis remanand wyth the said George Master of Angus, the said Robert Lundy of Balgony, knycht, in mane of our said soverane Lord, has afficit his signet and subscrivit the sammyn wyth his awin hand, day, zere and place forsaid, before thir witnes, reverand and venerable faderis in God, William Bishope of Abyrdeen, Prive Seyle to our soverane lord, James, Abbot of Scone, Alexander Lord Hume, gret Chalmerlane of Scotland, Waltyr Ker of Cesford, William Scot of Balwery, John Ramsay, knychtis, Master Rychait Lawsone etc. and Master James Henryson, wyth utheris divers.

b) Letter of remission to Patrick earl of Bothwell, dated 26th October 1500. (RMS, ii, 587.)

A letter of acquittance, remitt and discharge made to PATRIK ERLE BOTHUILE, lord Halis etc. direct to the sheriff of Roxburgh and his deputis, and to the thesourer and auditouris of the chekker being for the tyme : Makand mentioun that forsamekle as the said Patrik erle Bothuile was adjugit in the justiceare of Roxburgh haldin at Jedworth (22 Oct. 1498), in the soume of 550 lib. of usuale money of the realme, as plege for thir personis, ressavit be him in ane endentour from our soverane lordis crownar to haf enteri to the said are, that is to say, George Armistrang, Hectouris bruther, Wilzam Elwald his mach, Gerrard with the prik, with his sone, Henry Nicsoun, in Larishop, Golfrid Nicsoun thair, Edward Nicsoun thari,

David Crosar, Wilzem Elwald, Robert Elwald the king, Wilzam Elwald, Wilzammys sone, Johne Elwald in Thorleshop, Andro Elwald, Wilzammys son, Robert Elwald of the Langhalch, Johne Wighame alias Cok, Matho Crosar, Quintynis sone, Johne Elwald, Lowrence sone, Wilzam Elwald, alias Siders, Patrick Elwald, Gilbert Elwald, Nicholis sone, Henry Elwald, Rauf Elwald, Gilbert Crosar, Patrik Lauson, Ingrame Crosar, Wilzam Crosar, George Crosar, James' bruther, David Crosar at the Tempilhall, James Crosar alias Jak, Johne Crosar, Leill Crosar alias schevill, Alexander Armistrang, Henry Nicsoun Crakspere, John Nicsoun alias Johne Wilzame Nicsoun, Archibald Henrisoun, Gilbert Henrisoun, David Henrisoune, Wilzam Henrison, Robert simson callit Smyth, Robert Elwald callit zong ridar, Wilzame Crosar, James' son, Edward Crosar elder, Robert Armistrang callit Slittrik, David Trumbull with George Trumbull, Hector Armistrang, George Trumbull in the Hermitage, Patrick Tayt, Alexander Moscrop with George Trumbull, Medle John Burn in Branxholm and Wilzam of Lalgles with Hector Armistrangs bruther; and in like, the said Patrik erle Bothuile was adjudgit in uthir 550 lib. for the said personis in the justiceare of Roxburgh haldin at the said burgh of Jedworth (18 Mar. 1499), and als he was adjugit in the soume of 853 lib 6/8 as plege for Georg Hatlee, Andro Quhitelaw, Johne Hepburn, James Gray, Watt Pette, Alexander Quhitelaw, Wilzam Trumbull of Myntow, Mark Trumbull, Archibald Trumbull, James Trumbull brether, Johne Trumbull, Wilzame Trumbull, and George Trumbull, brether, and John of Dunbar, quhilkis war enterit be him befor the kingis hienes in the tolbuth of Striveling to haf underlyne his lawis for certaine crimes committit be thame, and thairefter lattin be our said soveran lord to borgh to him apon the said soume, quhilk eschapti fra him and war fra the kingis lawis, as the book of journall apon the premiss mare fullilie proportis; Nevertheles our said soverane lord having remembrance and consideratioun of the trew, afald, reddy, and thankful service done to his hienes be his said sousing, mony and divers wais, within the realme and utwoth, and of his besy and gret travale and laboris takin be him thairin to his gret and hevy costis and expens, and in stabilling of the cuntry quhilkis the personis forsaid and utheris undantit peple inhabitis - the king heirof, of his proper motive, fredome and favouris, has remittit and forgevin and be thir his lettrez remittis and frogenis to his said cousing Erle Bothuile all and sindre the soumez forsaid, extending in the hale to 1953 lib. 6/8 for the money forsaid, and for the kingis henes and his successouris quitclemys and dischargis him, his aeris, executouris and assignais of the sammyn and of al payment thairof in tyme to cum now and for everbe thir presentis; With a charge in the sammyn letter to the said schiref and his deputis and al utheris officiaris, leigis and subditis, that nane of thaim tak uppon hand to compel or distrenze the said Patrik erle Bothuile,

his aeris, executouris or assignais, in his or thair personis, landis or gudis quhatsumever, for the soumez above writin or ony part of thame in tyme to com, remittit and dischargit be the kingis henes as said is, but that thai desist and ces ulutterly thairfra under all the hiest paid and charge that efter may folow;- of the quhilk the kingis henes dischargis thaim and ilkan of thaim and thair deputis of thair officis in that part for ever be the said lettrez. With a charge to the tresourar and auditouris of the chekker being for the tyme to mak allowance and defess the said soumez in the chekker rollis to the said schiref and his deputis in thair next compt. efter the tennour of the said lettrez auhilk ze mak be insert in the said rollis for zouris and thare warrant, and thairefter to be deliverit again to the berar under the charge forsaid.

c) A compositour issued to John Grant of Fruchy, 15 July 1510.
(Fraser, Chiefs of Grant, iii, 56-7.)

Componitur cum Johanne Grant de Freuchy infra vicecomitatum de Elgin commorante, pro receptacione, communicacione, supplemento et assistencia, per ipsum datis et exhibitis revellibus domini regis ad cornu suum existentibus: et proomnibus crimine et actione que eidem recione premissorum imponi poterint: aceciam pro omnibus aliis actionibus, criminibus et offensis quibuscunque per dictum Johannem aliquibus preteritis usque in diem confectionis presencium commissis seu quomodolibet perpetratis; proditoria, tradicione, murthuro, communi furto, incendio, raptu mulierum, homicidio post exitum ultimi itineris iusticiarie de Elgin commisso exceptis. Subscriptum per Thesaurarium et compotitores apud Elgin xv die mensis Julii, A.D. millesimo quingentesimo decimo.

us

Georgius The
W. Aberd.
H. lord Sinclare.

.d) Agreement between the treasurer and sir John Wemyss for the payment of a composition, dated 26 June 1948.

At Edinburgh the xxvj day of the moneth of Junii in the yere of God a thousand four hundretht nynte and aucht yeris. It is apoyntit and accordit betwux our soverance lordis tresorare on the ta part and John of Vemis of that ilk knycht on the tother part, tuychyng the pament of ane hundretht markis til our soverance lord quhilk the said John of Vemis was condampnit in the last justice ayre haldin in Cowpar for the non entrais of Rebert Melvil to underly the law, that the said treasorare haf susplatit the pament of the samin quhil the tyme of Mertàmes nexit to cum. And for the securite of the pament of the said som the said John of Vemis sal ger prys two salt panis pertenyng to hym lydn in the Vemis be unsuspek personis and delyver to the said tresorare or to his factoris lyk as tha ar prysed, the quhilk pan is sal reman with the said Schir John of Vemis quhil Mertemes that nexit cumis and than gyf the said Schir John contentis and payis to the said tresorare or his factoris sa mekyl as the panis ar prysd to the panis sal reman with the said schir John and failyeand thareof the panis sal reman with the said tresorare. And for the pament of the remanent of the said som more than the panis extentis to the said Schir John sal fynd his bond men souerte to be pay to the tresorare at the said term of Mertemes and for the releven of the said souerte and pament to be mad the said Schir John sal gyf his obligation to the tresorare under his seal in the best form the said tresorare can devys, sa that the said souerte be kepit skathtles alvais and be relevyt be the said Schir John and the tresorare haf bot a pament of the said som of ane hundretht markis abon vrytyn. In vitnes herof baitht the said parties haf subscrafit this vryt with thar awn handis, day, here and place abone vrytyn.

e) Apprisal and sale of property belonging to lord Livingstone for the withholding of certain fines incurred at the justice ayre, dated 4 November 1507. (RMS, ii, 3150.)

Rex, - quia literis vicecimiti de Striveling directis ad distringendum Wil, dom. Livingstoun pro 295 mercis subi debitis pro certis amerchiamentis in quibus adjudicatus est in ultimo itinere justiciarie apud Striveling, - defectu bonorum mobilium tere subscripte, per dictum Wil. de refe per servitium warde et relevii in capite tente, apud Levilandis 19 Oct. 1507 pro dicta summa, cum 9 libris 17 solidis pro vicecomtis feodo, appreciate fuerunt et regi vendite, - et familiaris regis Jac. Schaw de Sauchy miles cum thesaurario composuit;- igitur concessit dicto Jacobo Schaw, heredibus

ejus et assignatis, - unam partem terrarum Grenoc, et binam partem de Clase, cum tertia parte de Estir Garquhenny, in baronia de Callander, vic. Striveling, extendens at 10 lib. terrarm: - et voluit quod dictus Wil. et heredes ejus haberent regressum quandocunque dictam summam, etc., persolverent infra septennium.

APPENDIX A/8 CROWN LEASES AND FEUS

a) Liferent lease under privy seal of Jas II to Walter Stewart of Arthorlie of the lands of Perthwick in the B of Renfrew, dated 22 Nov 1451. (Fraser, Memoirs of The Maxwells of Pollok, i, 168.)

'James be the grace of God Kingof Scottis, tiff all and sindry oure liegis and subditis to quhais lonawlage thir oure lettres salairn, greting. Wit ze us to have set and to male latt , and be thir our lettres settis and to male lattis til ane lovedo familiare squyer, Waltir Stewart of Arthorle all and sindry oure landis of Perthwic with the pertynens, lyande within the barony of Renfrew, within the shriefdome of that ilk, for all the termez of the saide Walteris life, enterande and bogynnande in the saide mailing at the fete of Whitsonday next folowing the date of thir letters: To be haldin and to be had all and hale the saidis oure fornemmyt landis of Perthwic, with the pertinents to the saide Walter Stewart and his subtenandis for all the termes of his life, of us and oure ayeis with all fredomez, proffittis, asiamentis and richtwis pertinents with commoun posture free ische and entre, fiely, quitely, wde and in pece, for outin ony againstanding or gaiwealling quhetsumevir, layande tharefore zereli the saide Walter and for ilk zere of his life tyme, til us and oure ayeris, ten pundis of usuale mone of oure realme, at the festis of Whitsonday and Sainte Madyne in wyntir, be evinly percioun, in name of male alonerly, for all other chargis: Quharefore straitle we forbid that only of oure lieges, of quhat degre or estate thirbe, tak on hande til vex, inquiet, dutiable, or male wrangwis impediment to the saide Waltir of his subtenandis in entermetting and manuyng of the saide oure landis of Perthwic, enduring the termez of his life, as saide is, under all pain and offens ze may inrin and commyt again oure maieste.

James R.

.b) Letter of tack and bailliery to sir Alexander Gordon of Midmar for the lands of Strathdee and Cromar, dated 17 March 1503-4.
(Antiquities of the shires of Aberdeen and Banff, iv, 216.)

A lettre of tak to Alexander Gordon of Megmet knycht of the landis of Strathde and Cromar liand within the schirefdome of Aberdene his enteray beginnand at the Feist of Witsounday nixt to cum efter the date of the said tak and thareftir to endure for five yeris to him his assignaid and subtennandis with all proffittis custumis mertis woddis, fischingis courte plante herezeld bludewite and merchete and wi∓h al uther pertinance pertenyng tharto, he payand tharfor yerlie the penny male of the saidis landis alanerly for al uther service. Providing that he sal nocht hew nor sell na grene wod of the said woddis as he will ansuer to the king tharapoun.

A letter of baleyery maid to the said Schir Alexander of the said landis for the said termes of five yeris with courtis to hald trespassouris to punys, amerciamentis unlawis and escheatis to rais til his awne use and proffeit in communi forma balliatus.

c) Commission to lease crown land, dated 15 June 1488.
Commissio assedacionis terrarum et dominorum domini regis, Magistro Alexandro Inglis, Archidiacono Santiandree, compotorum rotulatore. (ER, ix

James be the grace of God King of Scottis, to all and sindrie oure officiaris, liegis, and subditis quham it efferis quhais knawlage thir oure lettrex sal cum, greting. Wit ye us to have maid, constitut, and be thir oure lettrez makis, consitiutis, and ordanis our traist and welebelovit cousingis and consalouris Coline erel of Ergyle, our chancellar, Patrik lord Halis, maister of oure houshald, a venerable fadir in God Johne prior of Sanctandros, oure prive sele, Robert lord Lile, oure justice, Laurence lord Oliphant, Johne lord Drummond, sir Williame of Knollis, preceptour of Torfichin, oure thesaurar, maister Alexander Inglis, archdene of Sanctandros, our comptrollare, maister Williame Hepburne, vicar of Linlightgow, clerc of oure register, Archibald Edmonstoune of Duntreth, maister Richard Robinsone, persone of Suthik, and Johne Hepburne of Rolandstoune, and thre of thame conjunctlie, oure said comptrollar beand ane of the thre, oure commissaris to the thingis within written, gevand and granted to the saidis oure commissaris and to thre of thame conjunctlie, oure said comptrollare beand ane of the thre, oure full pouer and special mandiment to set all and sindre oure landis within oure realme that ar or beis lachfully

fundin vacand for male, gressome, and dewtez for the termez of thre yeris or five yeris as thai think expedient, and to continew and prolong for the saidis termez or schortar the takkis of the personis that has ony now to ryn, courtis to hald, trespassouris to punys, amerciamentis, unlawis, and eschetis to raise, and thairfor gif ned be to distrenye and to inbring the samyn to oure use, chaumerlanis, custumaris, balyeis, and all uther officiaris necligent in their officis to remove, and utheris to chese and mak in thare stedis, and generalie all uthir and sindri thingis to do excerse and use that to the setting of the saidis landis, continewing and prolonging of takkis, removing and chesing of the said officiaris, and doing of al uther thingis belanging tharto of law or consuetud ar knawin to partene; halding and for to hald ferme and stable all and aquhatsumever thingis oure said commissaris or thre of thame conjunctlie, oure said comptrollare beand ane, in the thingis forsaidis in oure name richtwisly ledis to be done. Quharfor we charge straitlie and commandis yow all and sindri oure officiaris, liegis, and subditis for saidis that ye and ilkane of yow redely intend, ansuer, and obey to the saidis oure commissaris and to thr of thaim conjunctly, oure said comptrollar beand ane of the thre as said is, in all and sindry thethingis above written and utheris quhatsumever concernyng the samyn under all the hiest pane and charge that efter may folow. Gevin undir oure prive sele at Edinburgh the xv day of June the yere of God l^{m}lllJ^{c} lxxxvlllJ yeris and of oure regne the first yere.

d) Charter of feu from James IV to John Grant of Freuchie of the royal property of Glencairny and Balnadalloch, dated 4 February 1498-9. (Fraser, The Chiefs of Grant, iii, 43-4.)

Jacobus dei graaa Rex Scotorum, omnibus probis hominibus tocius terre sue, clerias et laias, salutem : Saatis nos pro bono fideh et gratuito servicio nobis dilectum nostrum Johannem Graunt de Freuchy, tam tempore pacis quam guerre impenso et impendendo dedisse, concessisse et hac presenti carta nostra confirmasse dico Johanni totas et integras terras nostras de Glencarnee et Balnadaloch cum modendinis earundem cun suis pertinenciis iacentes infra viceoomitatum nostrum de Elgin et Fores: Tenendas et habendas totas et integras predictas terras de Glencarnee et Balnadalach cum molendinis earundem, cum suis pertinenais, dicto Johanni Grant et heredibus suis de nobis et successoribus nostris, in feodifirma et hereditate imperpetuum, per amnes rectas metas suas antiquas et divisas prout iacent in longitudine et latitudine, in bosas planis, moris merresiis, viis, semitis, aquis, stagnis, rivolis, pratis

pascuis et pasturis molendinis, multuris, et ecrum sequelis aucupacionibus venacionibus, piscacionibu, petariis, turbariis, carbonariis, lapicidiis lapide et calce fabrilibus, brasinis brueriis et genestis, cum curiis et earum exitibus hererebus, bludewitis, et merchetis mulierum, ac cum omnibus aliis et singulis libertatibus, commoditatibus, et asiamentis ac iustis pertinenciis suis quibuscunque, tam non nominatis quam nominatis tam subtus terra quam supra terram, procul et prope ad predictas terras et molendina sum pertinenciis spectantibus seu iuste spectave valentibus quomodolibet in futurum; libere, quiete, bene et in pace, sine aliqua revocacione seu contradicione per nos vel successores nostros quouismodo inde facienda in futurum: Reddendo inde annuatim dictus Johannes Graunt et heredes sui nobis et successoribus nostris, pro predicis terris et molendinis earundem cum pertinenciis, summam septuaginta uniis librarund usualis monete regni nostri ad duos onni terminos consuetos festa videlicet. Penteaostes et Santi Martini in yeme, per equales porciones nomine feodifirme tantum. Et si contigerit, quod absit, dictum Johannem vel heredes suos deficere in solucione dicte summe ad terminos suprascriptos, vel saltem in solucione ferme unius termini unte adventum secundi termini Pentecostes vel Sancti Martini proxime inde sequentis, volumus quod huicismodi donacio et infeodacio nostre deinde nullius sint valoris seu efficacie : Testibus, reverendo in cristo, patre, Willelmo espiscopo Abirdonensi, nostri secreti sigilli custode; dilectis censanguineis nostri Georgeo comite de Huntle, domino Badezenath, cancellario nostro, Archibalde comite de Ergile, domino Campbell et Lorne, magistro hospicii notri, Patricio comite de Bothuile domino Halis, Alexandro domino Hume magno camerario nostro, Robert Lundy de Balgony, milite, thesaurario nostro, et dilectis clerias nostris, magistris Ricardo Murehede, decano Glasguensi, secretario nostro, et Waltero Drummonde decano Dunblanensi, nostorum rotulatorum et registri ac conalii clerico: Apud Linthgow, quarto die mensis Februarii, anno Domini quadringentesimo nonagesimo octavo, et regni nostri undecimo.

è) Letter of Lease under the Privy Seal to Andrew Wood of Leith.
28 July 1477.

James be the grace of God King of Scottis to all and sindri oure leigis and subditis quham it efferis quhais knaulage thir our lettres sakum greting. Wit ye ws to have set and to ferme lattin and be thir oure lettres settis and to ferme lattis to oure lovet familiare serviture Andro Wode of Leith and to his assignayis ane or man, all and hale oure landis and toun of Largo with the pertinentis liand within oure schirefdome

of Fife, the entre of the saide Andro to the said tak of the saide landis and toun with the pertinentis beginnand the day of the making of thir present lettres, and thareftir to be haldin and to be had the said landis and toun with the pertinentis to the saide Andro and his assignayis ane or maa for all the termes of nynetene yeris full hale and togidder to be complete, with al commoditeis, proffittis, esmentis, and richwise pertinentis alswele nemmyt as nocht nemmyt that in ony wise richtwisely may pertene to the saide landis and toun, with power to mak subtennandis ane or maa as he or his assygnayis thinkis maiste expedient enduring the tyme above writin. The said Andro and his assignayis payand to ws yerely therfore and to oure ressavouis or intromettouris at twa usuale termes of the yere ten pundis threttene schillingis and foure pennyis of silver a chaldir and ten bollis of quhete two chaldir and two bollis of bere five chaldir of aitis twelf geis auchtene pultre alanerly for al uthir service average cariage exaccioun questioun or demaund that may be askit or requirit of the saide landis. Quhrefore we charge straitly and commandis all and sindri oure leigis and subditis foresaide and in speciale oure ressavouris, chaumerlanis, and intromettouris, that nane of yow tak uppoun hand to mak ony impediment letting or distublance to ye saide Andro his assignayis subtennandis servandis and in tromettouris in the broiking joising occupying and manuring of the saidis landis and toune with the pertinentis of thare utilite and profitt enduring ye termes of nyntene yeris as saidis, under al the hiest paine and charge that efter may folow. Gevin undir oure prive sele at Edinburgh the xxviii day of July the yere of God a thowsand fourehundreth sevinty and sevin yeris and of oure regnne ye xvii yere.

f) Dispute over the lease of the lands of Abernethy, dated 21 June 1496. (ADC, ii, 9-10)

Anent the complynt made be Robert Stewart, tennand of the landis of Abirnethe, apone Georg, Earl of Huntlye and Wilzeame of Gordone, his son, anent the landis of Abirnethy pertenyng to the saidis persons be ressone of tak and assedacione set be the Kingis hienes his commissionaris, and because that baith the saidis partyis producit the tak and assedacione of the saidis landis, ane under the Kingis privie seile and subscrivit with his hand of the daite of xxj day of December the yeire of God $j^{m}iiij^{c}$ nynti and five yeris, and the tother letter of assedacione set be the saidis commissionaris of the date of the thrid day of Februare the yere of God $j^{m}iiij^{c}$ nynti and five yeris, and because of thare double assedacione, the Lordis referrit the saidis complynt to the Kingis hienes,

and referrit again be his hienes to the saidis Lordis chargeng thame to do justice to baith the saidis partiis as thai wald ansuer to God and to his gude grace, as was writin on the bak of the saide complaynt be hand of Robert Colvile; The saidis partiis being personaly present, thare richtis, ressons and allegacions, togidder with the saidis letters of assecicions producit and schawin before Lordis, the saidis Lords Auditours decretis and deliveris that the saide Wilzeame of Gordoun sal broik and jois the saidis landis of Abirnethy efter the tenor of his assedacione, reservand to the said Robert to call ony persons that he plesis for ony soumes of money gevin for sade assedacione; and ordanis that letters neidefull be writin to the said Wilzeame hereuppone.

g) Judicial proceedings takun up by the crown against dubious feus, dated 18 March 1500-1. (ADC, ii, 492-3.)

Action on the Kingis behalf against John Bonar, Adnrew Wod and Walter Forester, knights, 'that is to say, the sade Jhone Bonar, pretendit tennand til the Kingis heines of the landis of Ester Rossy and the Aule of Rossy, Andro Wod, pretendit tennand til the Kingis hienes of the landis of Largo, Cragland, Bailzeland, with thre brewlandis, and Walter Forester, pretendit tennand til the Kingis hienes of the Torhed, til schew til oure soverane Lord and til his commissaris thare haldingis of the landis abonewrittin, togiddir with thare charteris and evidentis, gif thai ony have, of the saidis landis, be quhat tytill and be quhat service thai clame the sadis landis til be haldin of the Kingis hienes as superior thairof, and til underly and do that thai ar bound to under the perell of the law thairapone folowand'. Mr. James Henresoun compearing as King's advocate, but none of the defenders compearing, 'ane commessione under the quhite walx making the Lordis abonewritin comissaris in that part being producit, at lenth sene and undirstand, togiddir with ane autentik copy of the annexacione and producit, and utheris richtis, ressons, allegacions herd, sene at lenth and thairwith being avisit', the Lords ordain the defenders to 'deceist and ceiss fra the occupacione and intrometting of the sadis landis, and decernis the Kingis hienes til put his handis to the sammyn.

Action on the king's behalf against John of Leslye, pretended tenant to the king in the lands of Kntor, and Andrew Balfoure, pretended tenant to the king in the lands of Dullatir, Portbank and Monecastell, for the same effect as the preceding. The King's advocate compearing, but not the defenders, and production being made as before, the Lords decern as

in the last. Action on behalf of the King against William Collace, pretended tenant of the lands of the Greyneyards, and Michael Balfour of Burely, pretended tenant of the lands of Balgervy and the mill of Skeauch, to exhibit titles as above. The king's Advocate and the defenders compearing, the Lords decern as before, because the lands of Greneyards are annexed to the crown, and the gift which the said William had of them was from King James II in his nonage, and confirmation thereof by 'our sade soverane Lordis fader, the sadis landis being that tyme annexit or the sade confirmatioun' while the lands of Balgervy and the mill of Skeauch were under the King's revocation 'the tyme of the sade Mychell charter'.

Similar action on the king's behalf against Walter Heryot in respect of the lands of Berneturk, John of Murray in respect of the lands of Bordland of Ballach[illegible],'with the Hill, Ester Lochlyn, Wester Lochlyne and Trewyn, with the Dryyle' and James Hering in respect of the 'yle, loch, medow and superiorite of the landis of Clewny' for exhibition of titles. The King's advocate compearing, and Heriot compearing by David Balfoure of Caraldstone, his procurator, and James Hering personally the said David, procurator foresaid, alleged that Walter held the lands of Berneturk not of the King but of John of Lunnysdene of Berneturk and Hering alleged 'that his son Andro Hering was in fee of the yle, loch, medow and superiorite of the landis of Cleuny' and the liferent reserved to himself, 'and schew na thing thairappone' and sir William of Murray of Tulibardin compearing alleged 'that the sade unquhile Jhone of Murray was deceissit and Thomas Murray his aire unenterit thareto'. The Lords continue 'the accione and summondis of the sade Walter 'till 31 March instant and ordain John of Lunnysdene, his alleged overlord, to be cited to compear the 10th day of March instant to hear the King decerned to intromit with the lands and himself adjudged to refund the rents and profits thereof 'sen the tyme of the annexacione and revocacione of the smmyn'. They ordain James Hering and his son Andrew to compear on 31 March to hear as above and be adjudged to refund the rents and profits since the time of their intromission, and they also decern the said James to have 'tynt' the fee of the said subjects, 'because he grantit that his sade son was in fee thairof'. As to Murray, the Lords ordain breves to be issued from Chancery on behalf of the said Thomas, who in compearing on 31 March and he and be adjudged as above.

APPENDIX A/8

h) Dispute over the right of royal lease of the Spey fishing, dated 20 October 1495. (ADC, i, 393.)

Anent the term assignit to Alexander Innes of that ilke and James Douglas of Pettyndreich to produce and bring with thaim six richtis and evidentis as thai wald use anent the occupacioun and manuring of the fischíng of spey and als anent the actioun pursewit be the said James aganis the said Alexander for the uptaking and withhaldin of the proffitis and dewiteis of the said fischíng be the space of a zere bepast bath the saidis partiis beand personaly present and clamit the said tak to pertene to thaim be ressoun of tak in oure soverane Lordis Rentale. The copyis of the said Rentale grantit to baith the saidis partiiis under the signe and subscripcioun manuale of Edward Spittall Comptrollor Clerk at lenth sene hard and understandin, the Lordis of Consale beand thairwith reply avisit decrettis and deliveris that the said Alexander Innes of that ilke dois wrang in the occupacioun and manuring of the said fischíng because the assidcioun maid to the said James of Dowglas wes of the dait precedand the date of the assedacioun maid to said Alexander and within the termes of the sammyn. And therfore ordinis him to decist and cese therfra to be broikit and manurit be the said James efter the forme of the assedacioun as said is and for the termes contenit in the sammyn and als that the said Alexander sall content and pay to the said James of Dowglas aucht lastis of salmond and the two parte of a barell of sàlmond of the proffit of the two parte of a cowbill and xij uther nettis of the said watter of Spey full red and swet merchand was takin up and intromettit with be the said Alexander Innes of a yere last bipast as wes sufficiently preffit before the lordis and ordinis that letteez be writtin to distrenze the said Alexander his landis and gudis therfore.

i) Dispute over the lease of the lands of Auld Lindores, dated 10 October 1478. (ADC, i, 7.)

The Lordis ordanis that lettrez be writtin to the schireff of Fyfe charging him in continent to devoid and red Johne Gourlaw, Walter Smyth, Johne Methven, Alexander Ballingaw, Thomas Ballingaw, Johne Ballingaw, Robert Writ and Alexander Dysert furth of the landis of Ald Lundoris gevin and assignit be our soverance lord to John of Ballon as in contenit in his lettrez and that the keipe the said John undistrublit in the joysing of the said landis ay and quhill the said personis bring and schew before the lordis sufficiand lettrez of tak of mar strenth than the said John of Ballone has now schewin.

APPENDIX B/1 1507 AUDIT OF EXCHEQUER ACCOUNTS. (ER, xii, 483-609)

a)

DATE	BALLIVI AD EXTRA ACCOUNTS	CUSTUMARS ACCOUNTS	BURGH BAILLIE ACCOUNTS
12 July			Perth
26 "		Dundee	Edinburgh, Dundee
27 "	Auchterhouse	Edinburgh, Montrose	Kinghorn, Montrose
28 "	Fettercairn		
29 "	Kinclaven, Menteith, Forgundeny		Forfar
30 "	Methven	Cupar, Disart	Cupar
31 "	Strathearn	Crail, Pittenweem	Crail
2 Aug.	Moray, Stirlingshire	Dumbarton	
3 "	Dirleton	Haddington	Haddington, North Berwick
4 "	Fife	Northern Scotland	Irvine
5 "			Lauder, Jedburgh
6 "	Ross		
7 "	Ardmeanach		Pebbles, Rutherglen, Lanark
9 "	Carrick	Dumfries	Dumfries
11 "	Ettrick Forest, Grange of Dunbar, Galloway	Kirkcudbright	Kirkcudbright, Wigtown
12 "		Ayr	Ayr, Lochmaben
13 "	Ross (arrears), March		Dumbarton
14 "	Stewarton, Haliburton		
16 "			Nairn, Renfrew, Crail
17 "	Mountblare	Linlithgow	Linlithgow, Rothesay
18 "	Cowal		
19 "	Strathdon		Stirling, Aberdeen
20 "	Bute, Ballegarno		Inverness
21 "	Petty and Brackley	Stirling	
23 "	Ballincrieff, Orkney and Shetland	Aberdeen	
25 "	Cockburnspath		Kintore
26 "	Brechin, Strathdee		
29 "	Kintore, Linlithgowshire		
30 "		Inverkeithing	

POST SCACCARUUM (after the Exchequer)

13 Sept	Glencairnie	
14 "	Kintyre	

APPENDIX B/1 1507 AUDIT OF EXCHEQUER ACCOUNTS. (ER, xii, 483-609)

a)

DATE	BALLIVI AD EXTRA ACCOUNTS	CUSTUMARS ACCOUNTS	BURGH BAILLIE ACCOUNTS
12 July			Perth
26 "		Dundee	Edinburgh, Dundee
27 "	Auchterhouse	Edinburgh, Montrose	Kinghorn, Montrose
28 "	Fettercairn		
29 "	Kinclaven, Menteith, Forgundeny		Forfar
30 "	Methven	Cupar, Disart	Cupar
31 "	Strathearn	Crail, Pittenweem	Crail
2 Aug.	Moray, Stirlingshire	Dumbarton	
3 "	Dirleton	Haddington	Haddington, North Berwick
4 "	Fife	Northern Scotland	Irvine
5 "			Lauder, Jedburgh
6 "	Ross		
7 "	Ardmeanach		Pebbles, Rutherglen, Lanark
9 "	Carrick	Dumfries	Dumfries
11 "	Ettrick Forest, Grange of Dunbar, Galloway	Kirkcudbright	Kirkcudbright, Wigtown
12 "		Ayr	Ayr, Lochmaben
13 "	Ross (arrears), March		Dumbarton
14 "	Stewarton, Haliburton		
16 "			Nairn, Renfrew, Crail
17 "	Mountblare	Linlithgow	Linlithgow, Rothesay
18 "	Cowal		
19 "	Strathdon		Stirling, Aberdeen
20 "	Bute, Ballegarno		Inverness
21 "	Petty and Brackley	Stirling	
23 "	Ballincrieff, Orkney and Shetland	Aberdeen	
25 "	Cockburnspath		Kintore
26 "	Brechin, Strathdee		
29 "	Kintore, Linlithgowshire		
30 "		Inverkeithing	

POST SCACCARUUM (after the Exchequer)

13 Sept	Glencairnie	
14 "	Kintyre	

Original
Contains
Pullouts

APPENDIX B/1 1507 AUDIT OF EXCHEQUER ACCOUNTS. (ER, xii, 483-609)

a)

DATE	BALLIVI AD EXTRA ACCOUNTS	CUSTUMARS ACCOUNTS	BURGH BAILLIE ACCOUNTS
12 July			Perth
26 "		Dundee	Edinburgh, Dundee
27 "	Auchterhouse	Edinburgh, Montrose	Kinghorn, Montrose
28 "	Fettercairn		
29 "	Kinclaven, Menteith, Forgundeny		Forfar
30 "	Methven	Cupar, Disart	Cupar
31 "	Strathearn	Crail, Pittenweem	Crail
2 Aug.	Moray, Stirlingshire	Dumbarton	
3 "	Dirleton	Haddington	Haddington, North Berwick
4 "	Fife	Northern Scotland	Irvine
5 "			Lauder, Jedburgh
6 "	Ross		
7 "	Ardmeanach		Pebbles, Rutherglen, Lanark
9 "	Carrick	Dumfries	Dumfries
11 "	Ettrick Forest, Grange of Dunbar, Galloway	Kirkcudbright	Kirkcudbright, Wigtown
12 "		Ayr	Ayr, Lochmaben
13 "	Ross (arrears), March		Dumbarton
14 "	Stewarton, Haliburton		
16 "			Nairn, Renfrew, Crail
17 "	Mountblare	Linlithgow	Linlithgow, Rothesay
18 "	Cowal		
19 "	Strathdon		Stirling, Aberdeen
20 "	Bute, Ballegarno		Inverness
21 "	Petty and Brackley	Stirling	
23 "	Ballincrieff, Orkney and Shetland	Aberdeen	
25 "	Cockburnspath		Kintore
26 "	Brechin, Strathdee		
29 "	Kintore, Linlithgowshire		
30 "		Inverkeithing	

POST SCACCARUUM (after the Exchequer)

13 Sept	Glencairnie	
14 "	Kintyre	

APPENDIX B/2

a).

	FARMS				GROSS CHARGE				REAL REVENUE			
	1457	1458	1459	1460	1457	1458	1459	1460	1457	1458	1459	1460
Carrick	£ 58- 6- 8	£ 51-13- 4	£ -	£ 103- 6- 8	£ 192-13- 4	£ 51-13- 4	£ -	£ 123-10- 2	£ 38-16- 8	£ 35- 6- 8	£ -	£ 90-16-10
Methven	466- 9- 4	466- 9- 4	466- 9- 4	466- 9- 4	508- 9- 4	526- 9- 4	577- 2- 8	564-12- 8	316- 2- 9	350-10- 1	423-11- 1	346-12- 9
Strathearn) Menteith)	767- 6- 8	785- 6- 8	785- 6- 8	777- 6- 8	781-12-10	796- 0- 8	795- 0- 8	949- 6- 8	275- 6- 4	332- 8- 6	448-11-10	545-12- 6
March	576- 4-10	550- 3- 2	550-13- 2	550-13- 2	603- 7- 2	577-18-10	578- 8-10	607- 2- 2	60-18- 7	112-15- 0	138- 6- 8	173- 7- 2
Fife	560-12- 7	560-12- 7	579-17- 5	593-12-10	560-12- 7	560-12- 7	664- 0- 9	598-12-10	281- 0- 0	198-16- 2	363-19- 0	272- 8-11
Ettrick Forest	260-16- 8	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	260-16- 8	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	142-18- 4	285- 2- 0	212- 7- 8	332- 5- 0
Linlithgowshire	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	-	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	-	49-12- 5	78- 7- 2	50-14-10	-
Stewarton	127-13- 4	-	-	-	160- 0- 0	-	-	-	91- 6- 8	-	-	-
Annandale	35-13- 4	36- 1- 8	36-13- 4	36-13- 4	1,176- 5- 0	281-12- 0	847-18-10	497- 3- 6	8- 0- 0	5- 0- 0	25- 6- 8	-
Cowal	-	94- 0- 0	31- 6- 8	31- 6- 8	-	201- 0- 0	31- 6- 8	31- 6- 8	-	76-13- 4	-	31- 0- 0
Fettercairn	-	-	-	142- 0- 8	-	-	-	142- 0- 8	-	-	-	80- 0- 8
Ballincrieff	441- 1- 4	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	44- 1- 4	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	37- 4- 8	73- 9- 4	73- 9- 4	73- 9- 4
Bute & Arran	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	199-17- 2	200-17- 2	35-13- 2	35-13- 2	58- 6- 8	77- 0- 0
Galloway	468- 2- 0	472- 2- 0	472- 2- 0	472- 2- 0	506-10- 2	613- 8- 8	567-13- 0	623- 0- 8	5- 4-11	394- 0- 2	258-10- 8	339- 9- 6
Moray	695-14- 5	695-14- 5			988-19- 9	756- 7- 9			129-19- 7	254-13- 0	-	-
Mar	568-12- 5	570-10- 4			607- 0- 3	609-19- 0			185-15- 0	307-14- 2	-	-
Crown Land North of the Dee	-	-	1,301-19- 1	1,304-17- 5			1,368-19-11	1,602-14- 9	-	-	281-17- 4	507-19- 5
Stirlingshire	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266-1- 6	117- 9- 8	148-17- 8	179-18- 4	220-12- 0
	£5,235- 9-11	£5,496- 6- 0	£5,438- 0- 0	£5,551- 3- 5	£6,996- 4- 9	£6,188-14- 5	£6,645- 3- 8	£6,814- 5- 5	£1,775- 8- 9	£2,689- 6- 5	£2,515- 0- 1	£3,090-14- 1
4 Year Average		£5,430- 0- 0				£6,661- 0- 0				£2,518- 0- 0		

APPENDIX B/2

a).

	FARMS				GROSS CHARGE				REAL REVENUE			
	1457	1458	1459	1460	1457	1458	1459	1460	1457	1458	1459	1460
Carrick	£ 58- 6- 8	£ 51-13- 4	£ -	£ 103- 6- 8	£ 192-13- 4	£ 51-13- 4	£ -	£ 123-10- 2	£ 38-16- 8	£ 35- 6- 8	£ -	£ 90-16-10
Methven	466- 9- 4	466- 9- 4	466- 9- 4	466- 9- 4	508- 9- 4	526- 9- 4	577- 2- 8	564-12- 8	316- 2- 9	350-10- 1	423-11- 1	346-12- 9
Strathearn)	767- 6- 8	785- 6- 8	785- 6- 8	777- 6- 8	781-12-10	796- 0- 8	795- 0- 8	949- 6- 8	275- 6- 4	332- 8- 6	448-11-10	545-12- 6
Menteith)												
March	576- 4-10	550- 3- 2	550-13- 2	550-13- 2	603- 7- 2	577-18-10	578- 8-10	607- 2- 2	60-18- 7	112-15- 0	138- 6- 8	173- 7- 2
Fife	560-12- 7	560-12- 7	579-17- 5	593-12-10	560-12- 7	560-12- 7	664- 0- 9	598-12-10	281- 0- 0	198-16- 2	363-19- 0	272- 8-11
Ettrick Forest	260-16- 8	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	260-16- 8	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	519-13- 4	142-18- 4	285- 2- 0	212- 7- 8	332- 5- 0
Linlithgowshire	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	-	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	-	49-12- 5	78- 7- 2	50-14-10	-
Stewarton	127-13- 4	-	-	-	160- 0- 0	-	-	-	91- 6- 8	-	-	-
Annandale	35-13- 4	36- 1- 8	36-13- 4	36-13- 4	1,176- 5- 0	281-12- 0	847-18-10	497- 3- 6	8- 0- 0	5- 0- 0	25- 6- 8	-
Cowal	-	94- 0- 0	31- 6- 8	31- 6- 8	-	201- 0- 0	31- 6- 8	31- 6- 8	-	76-13- 4	-	31- 0- 0
Fettercairn	-	-	-	142- 0- 8	-	-	-	142- 0- 8	-	-	-	80- 0- 8
Ballincrieff	441- 1- 4	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	44- 1- 4	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	37- 4- 8	73- 9- 4	73- 9- 4	73- 9- 4
Bute & Arran	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	198-17- 2	199-17- 2	200-17- 2	35-13- 2	35-13- 2	58- 6- 8	77- 0- 0
Galloway	468- 2- 0	472- 2- 0	472- 2- 0	472- 2- 0	506-10- 2	613- 8- 8	567-13- 0	623- 0- 8	5- 4-11	394- 0- 2	258-10- 8	339- 9- 6
Moray	695-14- 5	695-14- 5			988-19- 9	756- 7- 9			129-19- 7	254-13- 0	-	-
Mar	568-12- 5	570-10- 4			607- 0- 3	609-19- 0			185-15- 0	307-14- 2	-	-
Crown Land North of the Dee	-	-	1,301-19- 1	1,304-17- 5			1,368-19-11	1,602-14- 9	-	-	281-17- 4	507-19- 5
Stirlingshire	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266-1- 6	117- 9- 8	148-17- 8	179-18- 4	220-12- 0
	£5,235- 9-11	£5,496- 6- 0	£5,438- 0- 0	£5,551- 3- 5	£6,996- 4- 9	£6,188-14- 5	£6,645- 3- 8	£6,814- 5- 5	£1,775- 8- 9	£2,689- 6- 5	£2,515- 0- 1	£3,090-14- 1
4 Year Average		£5,430- 0- 0				£6,661- 0- 0				£2,518- 0- 0		

BALLIVI AD EXTRA	FARMS 1485	FARMS 1486	FARMS 1487	FARMS 1488	GROSS FARM 1485	GROSS FARM 1486	GROSS FARM 1487	GROSS FARM 1488	REAL REVENUE 1485	REAL REVENUE 1486	REAL REVENUE 1487	REAL REVENUE 1488
Carrick	£ -	£ 272- 1- 8	£ 142-14- 2	£ 149- 7- 6	£ -	£ 272- 1- 8	£ 144-14- 4	£1,064-17- 6	£ -	£ 204- 0- 0	£ 90- 0- 0	£ 110- 0- 0
Petty & Brauchly	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	-	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	-	75- 0- 0	164- 0- 0	46-10- 0	-
Kinclevin etc.	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	471- 6- 8	371-13- 4	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	328-10- 0	117-17- 0	298- 6- 8	57-15- 0
Methven	175-11- 4	175-11- 4	-	351- 2- 8	201- 6- 4	175-11- 4	-	351- 2- 8	79- 6- 7	103-14- 1	-	13- 0- 0
Strathearn	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	651- 0- 0	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	366-12- 8	132- 8-10	802- 7-10	-
Menteith	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	513- 3- 4	698-16- 8	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	372-13- 6	148- 0- 0	740- 5-10	-
March	-	2,113-13- 6	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8	-	2,930- 0- 5	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	-	639- 9- 4	39- 0- 4	85- 0- 0
Fife	612-17- 2	606-17- 3	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	618- 3-11	626-17- 3	955- 6-11	632-12- 1	-	38-13- 4	796-10-10	369- 5-10
Kintore etc.	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	8-16- 0	26- 6- 8	38- 0- 0	39-12- 0
Ward of Tweed	110- 3- 4	110- 3- 4	110- 3- 4	110- 3- 4	201-10- 0	159- 9- 0	143- 2-10	110- 3- 4	169- 6- 8	60-13- 0	215-16- 6	132- 1- 3
Ward of Ettrick	-	819- 0- 0	273- 0- 0	-	-	819- 0- 0	470-13- 4	-	-	10- 0- 0	183- 2- 0	-
Ward of Yarrow	142-10- 0	142-10- 0	142-10- 0	142-10- 0	241-16- 8	233- 8- 0	202-15- 7	142-10- 0	82-13- 0	32-12- 0	139- 3- 8	45-12- 2
Orkney and Shetland	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	130- 0- 0	279- 3- 4	282- 3- 0	213- 6- 8
Linlithgowshire	-	357- 0- 4	178-10- 2	178-10- 2	-	367- 9- 3	219- 4-10	178-10- 2	-	36-17-11	30- 2-10	6- 0- 0
Stewarton	-	263- 6- 8	131-13- 4	131-13- 4	-	268-13- 4	131-13- 4	121-13- 4	-	64- 0- 0	31- 0- 0	30- 0- 0
Kilmarnock	-	-	-	209-15- 4	-	-	-	209-15- 4	-	-	-	20-15- 0
Cowal	-	-	-	219- 6- 8	-	-	-	322- 0- 0	-	-	-	-
Fettercairn	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	-	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	-	51-18- 4	49-11- 8	54- 5 -0	-
Ballincrieff	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	128- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	52-16- 0	69- 6- 8	64- 3- 6	25- 0- 0
Bute	-	734-12- 6	146-18- 6	146-18- 6	-	734-12- 6	146-18- 6	187-18-10	-	15- 0- 0	23-11- 6	-
Arran	-	341-12- 0	-	-	-	341-12- 0	-	-	-	40- 0- 0	-	-
Ross	-	850- 0- 0	283- 6- 8	283- 6- 8	-	850- 0- 0	283- 6- 8	283- 6- 8	-	-	-	-
Galloway	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	656-19- 4	973- 9- 4	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	537-15-11	567- 9- 4	425- 4- 4	381- 8- 0
Moray	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	446- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	440- 5- 6	270-19- 4	242-16- 2	207- 0- 0
Strathdee and Cromar	-	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	201- 0- 0	199- 0- 0	171- 0- 0
Strathdon and Garioch	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350-3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	212-17- 6	180- 0- 0	263- 5- 0	239- 6- 8
Stirlingshire	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	396- 3- 6	266- 1- 6	106- 4- 2	108-15- 7	236- 9- 2	101-19-10
TOTAL	£4,747-18- 9	£10,935- 5- 5	£6,594- 8- 9	£6,712-16- 9	£5,281-13- 9	£12,948-18- 3	£7,389- 8- 9	£7,780-10- 4	£3,014-15-10	£3,559-18- 1	£5,241- 4- 2	£2,245-12- 5
4 Year Average		£ 7,248- 0- 0				£ 8,350- 0- 0				£3,516- 0- 0		

BALLIVI AD EXTRA	FARMS 1485	1486	1487	1488	GROSS FARM 1485	1486	1487	1488	REAL REVENUE 1485	1486	1487	1488
Carrick	£ -	£ 272- 1- 8	£ 142-14- 2	£ 149- 7- 6	£ -	£ 272- 1- 8	£ 144-14- 4	£1,064-17- 6	£ -	£ 204- 0- 0	£ 90- 0- 0	£ 110- 0- 0
Petty & Brauchly	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	-	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	317-15- 0	-	75- 0- 0	164- 0- 0	46-10- 0	-
Kinclevin etc.	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	471- 6- 8	371-13- 4	368-13- 4	368-13- 4	328-10- 0	117-17- 0	298- 6- 8	57-15- 0
Methven	175-11- 4	175-11- 4	-	351- 2- 8	201- 6- 4	175-11- 4	-	351- 2- 8	79- 6- 7	103-14- 1	-	13- 0- 0
Strathearn	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	651- 0- 0	370- 3- 4	370- 3- 4	366-12- 8	132- 8-10	802- 7-10	-
Menteith	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	513- 3- 4	698-16- 8	454- 3- 4	454- 3- 4	372-13- 6	148- 0- 0	740- 5-10	-
March	-	2,113-13- 6	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8	-	2,930- 0- 5	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	-	639- 9- 4	39- 0- 4	85- 0- 0
Fife	612-17- 2	606-17- 3	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	618- 3-11	626-17- 3	955- 6-11	632-12- 1	-	38-13- 4	796-10-10	369- 5-10
Kintore etc.	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	94- 6- 8	8-16- 0	26- 6- 8	38- 0- 0	39-12- 0
Ward of Tweed	110- 3- 4	110- 3- 4	110- 3- 4	110- 3- 4	201-10- 0	159- 9- 0	143- 2-10	110- 3- 4	169- 6- 8	60-13- 0	215-16- 6	132- 1- 3
Ward of Ettrick	-	819- 0- 0	273- 0- 0	-	-	819- 0- 0	470-13- 4	-	-	10- 0- 0	183- 2- 0	-
Ward of Yarrow	142-10- 0	142-10- 0	142-10- 0	142-10- 0	241-16- 8	233- 8- 0	202-15- 7	142-10- 0	82-13- 0	32-12- 0	139- 3- 8	45-12- 2
Orkney and Shetland	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	130- 0- 0	279- 3- 4	282- 3- 0	213- 6- 8
Linlithgowshire	-	357- 0- 4	178-10- 2	178-10- 2	-	367- 9- 3	219- 4-10	178-10- 2	-	36-17-11	30- 2-10	6- 0- 0
Stewarton	-	263- 6- 8	131-13- 4	131-13- 4	-	268-13- 4	131-13- 4	121-13- 4	-	64- 0- 0	31- 0- 0	30- 0- 0
Kilmarnock	-	-	-	209-15- 4	-	-	-	209-15- 4	-	-	-	20-15- 0
Cowal	-	-	-	219- 6- 8	-	-	-	322- 0- 0	-	-	-	-
Fettercairn	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	-	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	77-15- 0	-	51-18- 4	49-11- 8	54- 5 -0	-
Ballincrieff	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	128- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	88- 2- 8	52-16- 0	69- 6- 8	64- 3- 6	25- 0- 0
Bute	-	734-12- 6	146-18- 6	146-18- 6	-	734-12- 6	146-18- 6	187-18-10	-	15- 0- 0	23-11- 6	-
Arran	-	341-12- 0	-	-	-	341-12- 0	-	-	-	40- 0- 0	-	-
Ross	-	850- 0- 0	283- 6- 8	283- 6- 8	-	850- 0- 0	283- 6- 8	283- 6- 8	-	-	-	-
Galloway	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	656-19- 4	973- 9- 4	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	537-15-11	567- 9- 4	425- 4- 4	381- 8- 0
Moray	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	446- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	432- 6- 8	440- 5- 6	270-19- 4	242-16- 2	207- 0- 0
Strathdee and Cromar	-	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	201- 0- 0	199- 0- 0	171- 0- 0
Strathdon and Garioch	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350-3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	350- 3- 4	212-17- 6	180- 0- 0	263- 5- 0	239- 6- 8
Stirlingshire	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	266- 1- 6	396- 3- 6	266- 1- 6	106- 4- 2	108-15- 7	236- 9- 2	101-19-10
TOTAL	£4,747-18- 9	£10,935- 5- 5	£6,594- 8- 9	£6,712-16- 9	£5,281-13- 9	£12,948-18- 3	£7,389- 8- 9	£7,780-10- 4	£3,014-15-10	£3,559-18- 1	£5,241- 4- 2	£2,245-12- 5
4 Year Average		£ 7,248- 0- 0				£ 8,350- 0- 0				£3,516- 0- 0		

FARMS	GROSS CHARGE				REAL REVENUE							
	1509	1510	1512	1513	1509	1510	1512	1513	1509	1510	1512	1513
Carrick	£ 179- 6-10	£ 179- 6-10	£ -	£ 358-13- 8	£ 179- 6-10	£ 179- 6-10	£ -	£ 358-13- 8	£ 136-16-10	£ 122- 6-10	£ -	£ 118- 8- 4
Petty and Brauchly	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	122-12- 4	134-17- 4	2[illegible] 2- 4	-
Kinclevin etc.	403- 4- 4	403- 4- 4	450-11- 0	450-11- 0	403- 4- 4	469-17- 8	450-11- 0	450-11- 0	301-11- 2	304-17- 4	227- 3- 6	267- 6- 8
Methven	100- 0- 0	100- 0- 0	107- 0- 0	107- 0- 0	100- 0- 0	100- 0- 0	152- 0- 0	107- 0- 0	60-13- 4	60-13- 4	93- 0- 0	71- 2- 0
Strathearn	668-13- 4	668-13- 4	874-10- 0	874-10- 0	675-13- 4	1,321- 6- 8	879-16- 8	885- 3- 4	622-10- 6	564- 8- 4	643- 3- 2	835-14- 4
Menteith	458- 3- 4	458- 3- 4	-	870- 6- 8	493-16- 8	1,106- 3- 4	-	870- 3- 4	465- 9- 8	361-12- 0	-	629-18- 2
March	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	40- 0- 0	166-13- 4	165- 1- 7	133- 1- 7
Fife	618- 9-11	618- 9-11	970- 7- 1	966- 7- 1	630- 9-11	1,390-18- 7	1,106- 0- 5	966- 7- 1	705- 8- 4	542- 6- 5	512-18- 6	639-15- 5
Kintore	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	-	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	-	23- 5- 0	125- 5- 0	74-10- 4	-
Ettrick Forest	2,670- 3- 4	2,670- 3- 4	2,672-16- 8	2,672-16- 8	2,670- 3- 4	2,670- 3- 4	2,984-16- 8	2,672-16- 8	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4	1,675-14- 9	1,601- 2-11
Orkney and Shetland	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	216-19- 6	403- 6- 8	402- 5- 0	236- 0- 3
Linlithgowshire	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	6-10- 0	8- 0- 0	8-13- 4	5-13- 8
Cowal	71- 6- 8	71- 6- 8	-	-	71- 6- 8	71- 6- 8	-	-	30- 6- 8	32-13- 4	-	-
Ardmannach	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	114-11- 4	129- 4- 8	129- 4- 8	-
Fettercairn	77- 5- 0	-	77- 5- 0	77- 5- 0	77- 5- 0	-	77- 5- 0	77- 5- 0	40-11- 8	-	40- 6- 8	53-18- 4
Brechin and Nevar	266-13- 4	266-13- 4	-	-	323- 6- 8	266-13- 4	-	-	190-19- 4	290- 8- 0	-	-
Ballincrieff	-	129-11- 4	64-15- 8	64-15- 8	-	129-11- 4	64-15- 8	64-15- 8	-	31- 0- 1	8-13- 4	20- 6- 9
Bute	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	62- 1- 1	59-16- 8	-	-
Ross	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	156- 6- 6	155-19-10	169- 0- 0	171-11-10
Galloway	1,036-17- 8	1,036-17- 8	-	1,036-17- 8	1,066-17- 8	1,063-11- 0	-	1,046-17- 8	469- 6- 0	885-10- 4	-	735-18- 4
Moray	282- 6- 9	282- 6- 9	282- 6- 9	282- 6- 9	463-18- 6	282- 6- 9	393-18- 1	282- 6- 9	325- 2- 3	124-11- 8	219- 7- 0	146- 7- 9
Strathdee and Cromar	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	-	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	-	247- 0- 0	142- 0- 0	-	-
Garioch	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	306- 6- 8	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	145-15- 0	296-18- 4	146-10- 0	140- 0- 0
Strathdon	112- 8- 0	-	-	-	112- 8- 0	-	-	-	49-10- 0	-	-	-
Stirlingshire	358-15- 6	371-15- 5	355- 2- 1	369- 1- 1	360- 5- 6	371-15- 5	355- 2- 1	369- 1- 1	246- 3- 2	107-12- 5	64- 5- 4	36-18- 0
Grange of Dunbar	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	346-13- 4	396-13- 4	346-13- 4	346-13- 4
Glencairny	258- 0- 0	255- 0- 0	-	510- 0- 0	258- 0- 0	255- 0- 0	-	510- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191-10- 0	-	384- 0- 0
Kintyre	771- 3-10	385-11-11	-	-	771- 3-10	385-11-11	-	-	73- 0- 0	178- 0-10	-	-
TOTAL	£11,424- 1- 0	£10,767- 7- 4	£8,503-17- 5	£11,205- 7- 9	£11,748- 9- 5	£13,084-19- 4	£9,113- 8- 9	£11,225-17- 9	£7,354-14- 4	£7,496-19- 5	£4,928-12-11	£6,717-15- 0
4 Year Average		£10,475- 0- 0				£11,293- 0- 0				£6,625[illegible] 0- 0		

FARMS	GROSS CHARGE				REAL REVENUE			
	1509	1510	1512	1513	1509	1510	1512	1513	1509	1510	1512	1513
Carrick	£ 179- 6-10	£ 179- 6-10	£ -	£ 358-13- 8	£ 179- 6-10	£ 179- 6-10	£ -	£ 358-13- 8	£ 136-16-10	£ 122- 6-10	£ -	£ 118- 8- 4
Petty and Brauchly	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	221- 4- 0	122-12- 4	134-17- 4	2- 2- 4	-
Kinclevin etc.	403- 4- 4	403- 4- 4	450-11- 0	450-11- 0	403- 4- 4	469-17- 8	450-11- 0	450-11- 0	301-11- 2	304-17- 4	227- 3- 6	267- 6- 8
Methven	100- 0- 0	100- 0- 0	107- 0- 0	107- 0- 0	100- 0- 0	100- 0- 0	152- 0- 0	107- 0- 0	60-13- 4	60-13- 4	93- 0- 0	71- 2- 0
Strathearn	668-13- 4	668-13- 4	874-10- 0	874-10- 0	675-13- 4	1,321- 6- 8	879-16- 8	885- 3- 4	622-10- 6	564- 8- 4	643- 3- 2	835-14- 4
Menteith	458- 3- 4	458- 3- 4	-	870- 6- 8	493-16- 8	1,106- 3- 4	-	870- 3- 4	465- 9- 8	361-12- 0	-	629-18- 2
March	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	40- 0- 0	166-13- 4	165- 1- 7	133- 1- 7
Fife	618- 9-11	618- 9-11	970- 7- 1	966- 7- 1	630- 9-11	1,390-18- 7	1,106- 0- 5	966- 7- 1	705- 8- 4	542- 6- 5	512-18- 6	639-15- 5
Kintore	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	-	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	84- 6- 8	-	23- 5- 0	125- 5- 0	74-10- 4	-
Ettrick Forest	2,670- 3- 4	2,670- 3- 4	2,672-16- 8	2,672-16- 8	2,670- 3- 4	2,670- 3- 4	2,984-16- 8	2,672-16- 8	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4	1,675-14- 9	1,601- 2-11
Orkney and Shetland	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	433- 6- 8	216-19- 6	403- 6- 8	402- 5- 0	236- 0- 3
Linlithgowshire	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	6-10- 0	8- 0- 0	8-13- 4	5-13- 8
Cowal	71- 6- 8	71- 6- 8	-	-	71- 6- 8	71- 6- 8	-	-	30- 6- 8	32-13- 4	-	-
Ardmannach	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	192-14- 2	114-11- 4	129- 4- 8	129- 4- 8	-
Fettercairn	77- 5- 0	-	77- 5- 0	77- 5- 0	77- 5- 0	-	77- 5- 0	77- 5- 0	40-11- 8	-	40- 6- 8	53-18- 4
Brechin and Nevar	266-13- 4	266-13- 4	-	-	323- 6- 8	266-13- 4	-	-	190-19- 4	290- 8- 0	-	-
Ballincrieff	-	129-11- 4	64-15- 8	64-15- 8	-	129-11- 4	64-15- 8	64-15- 8	-	31- 0- 1	8-13- 4	20- 6- 9
Bute	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	142- 3- 3	62- 1- 1	59-16- 8	-	-
Ross	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	288-13- 4	156- 6- 6	155-19-10	169- 0- 0	171-11-10
Galloway	1,036-17- 8	1,036-17- 8	-	1,036-17- 8	1,066-17- 8	1,063-11- 0	-	1,046-17- 8	469- 6- 0	885-10- 4	-	735-18- 4
Moray	282- 6- 9	282- 6- 9	282- 6- 9	282- 6- 9	463-18- 6	282- 6- 9	393-18- 1	282- 6- 9	325- 2- 3	124-11- 8	219- 7- 0	146- 7- 9
Strathdee and Cromar	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	-	442- 0- 0	221- 0- 0	-	-	247- 0- 0	142- 0- 0	-	-
Garioch	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	306- 6- 8	155- 3- 4	155- 3- 4	145-15- 0	296-18- 4	146-10- 0	140- 0- 0
Strathdon	112- 8- 0	-	-	-	112- 8- 0	-	-	-	49-10- 0	-	-	-
Stirlingshire	358-15- 6	371-15- 5	355- 2- 1	369- 1- 1	360- 5- 6	371-15- 5	355- 2- 1	369- 1- 1	246- 3- 2	107-12- 5	64- 5- 4	36-18- 0
Grange of Dunbar	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	366-13- 4	346-13- 4	396-13- 4	346-13- 4	346-13- 4
Glencairny	258- 0- 0	255- 0- 0	-	510- 0- 0	258- 0- 0	255- 0- 0	-	510- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191-10- 0	-	384- 0- 0
Kintyre	771- 3-10	385-11-11	-	-	771- 3-10	385-11-11	-	-	73- 0- 0	178- 0-10	-	-
TOTAL	£11,424- 1- 0	£10,767- 7- 4	£8,503-17- 5	£11,205- 7- 9	£11,748- 9- 5	£13,084-19- 4	£9,113- 8- 9	£11,225-17- 9	£7,354-14- 4	£7,496-19- 5	£4,928-12-11	£6,717-15- 0
4 Year Average		£10,475- 0- 0				£11,293- 0- 0				£6,625- 0- 0		

APPENDIX B/2

b) ROYAL ESTATES IN LINLITHGOWSHIRE (ER, vi, 561-3, x, 32-4, xiii, 407-410)

	1459	1488	1512
Fee of Elizabeth de Gelria	£10- 8- 0		
Fee of Carrick Pursuivant	10- 0- 0		
Life Grant of Houstoun Sir David Hume	22-13- 4		
Life Grant of Drumcorse Agnes, widow of John Nurse of Prince James, now king		£ 10- 8- 0	
Life Grant of WRA Mary Young, niece of duke of Ross		10-13- 4	
Assignation of Bonnyton and Blackness John Ross of Halkhead as keeper of Blackness Castle		26-13- 4	
Concession of Kingsfield Patick Johnstone		1- 0- 0	
Assignation of and Brewlands Chaplain of St.Ninians		1- 0- 0	£ 1- 0- 0
Assignation of Houstoun and Strathbrok Colin, Earl of Argyll		40- 0- 0	
Fee of William Sellar from farms of Kirkhill		10- 0- 0	
Fee of William Cochburn from farms of Mill of Abercorn		6-13- 4	
Fee of Sir Simon Preston of Craigmillar from farms of Kingscavil		6-13-4	
Annual Rent James Amisfield			4- 6- 8
Life Grant of Demesne, Mill and Cottages of Houstoun Sir James Sinclair			35-16- 0
Fee Unicorn Herald			10- 0- 0
Fee Thomas Shaw, Cook			10- 8- 0
Assignation of acres of burgh of Linlithgow Abbot of Holyrood in exchange for land near Leith			14-14- 4
Assignation of Kingscavil Sir Alexander McCulloch for keeping Linlithgow Palace			10- 0- 0
Fee Sir Patrick Hamilton as deeper of Blackness Castle			26-13- 4
Mortmain of Kirkhill Chapel of Restalrig			10- 0- 0
Life Grant of Kingscavil Sir Patrick Hamilton			15- 6- 8
Total Allowance	£43- 1- 4	£113- 1- 4	£138- 5- 0
Gross Charge	£140-17- 8	£178-10- 2	£182-16-10
Percentage Allenation	30%	64%	76%

APPENDIX B/2

b) ROYAL ESTATES IN LINLITHGOWSHIRE (ER, vi, 561-3, x, 32-4, xiii, 407-410)

	1459	1488	1512
Fee of Elizabeth de Gelria	£10- 8- 0		
Fee of Carrick Pursuivant	10- 0- 0		
Life Grant of Houstoun Sir David Hume	22-13- 4		
Life Grant of Drumcorse Agnes, widow of John Nurse of Prince James, now king		£ 10- 8- 0	
Life Grant of WRA Mary Young, niece of duke of Ross		10-13- 4	
Assignation of Bonnyton and Blackness John Ross of Halkhead as keeper of Blackness Castle		26-13- 4	
Concession of Kingsfield Patick Johnstone		1- 0- 0	
Assignation of and Brewlands Chaplain of St.Ninians		1- 0- 0	£ 1- 0- 0
Assignation of Houstoun and Strathbrok Colin, Earl of Argyll		40- 0- 0	
Fee of William Sellar from farms of Kirkhill		10- 0- 0	
Fee of William Cochburn from farms of Mill of Abercorn		6-13- 4	
Fee of Sir Simon Preston of Craigmillar from farms of Kingscavil	6-13-4		
Annual Rent James Amisfield			4- 6- 8
Life Grant of Demesne, Mill and Cottages of Houstoun Sir James Sinclair			35-16- 0
Fee Unicorn Herald			10- 0- 0
Fee Thomas Shaw, Cook			10- 8- 0
Assignation of acres of burgh of Linlithgow Abbot of Holyrood in exchange for land near Leith			14-14- 4
Assignation of Kingscavil Sir Alexander McCulloch for keeping Linlithgow Palace			10- 0- 0
Fee Sir Patrick Hamilton as deeper of Blackness Castle			26-13- 4
Mortmain of Kirkhill Chapel of Restalrig			10- 0- 0
Life Grant of Kingscavil Sir Patrick Hamilton			15- 6- 8
Total Allowance	£43- 1- 4	£113- 1- 4	£138- 5- 0
Gross Charge	£140-17- 8	£178-10- 2	£182-16-10
Percentage Allenation	30%	64%	76%

APPENDIX B/2

c) ALIENATION OF REVENUE FROM PORTIONS OF ROYAL DEMESNE IN VARIOUS TYPES OF PATRONAGE

a) EARLDOM OF MARCH

	ER, vi, 333-338		ER, ix, 126-9		ER, viii, 465-7	
LAND	1457	Annual Farm	1488	Annual Farm	1512	Annual Farm
Burgh Farms & Mills of Dunbar	Payment to 2 Chaplains at College of Dunbar	£ 20- 0- 0	Payment 2 Chaplains at College of Dunbar	£ 20- 0- 0	Concession 2 Chaplains at College of Dunbar	£ 20- 0- 0
Little Pinkerton and Newtown Leis	Assignation Robert Liddale for Fee as Keeper of Dunbar Castle	18-13- 4				
Ersiltown	Occuptation by William Cranstone of Corsby	50-17-10	Concession John Hume of Whiterig his alienation of earl of Angus	59-10- 0	Concession late Kentigern Hume	59- 0- 0
Greenlaw	Occupation by Thomas Cranstone	35-10- 0			Life Grant Roger Shoriswood, Hailes Pursuivant	6-13- 4
Duns	Occupation by Sir David Hume	18-18- 8				
Chirnside	Occupation by Air Alex. Hume	42-11-2	Concession Alexander Hume	32- 0- 0	Concession Alex. Lord Hume	42- 0- 0
Cadeschele	Occupation by Thomas Hume	5- 6- 8	Concession George Hume of Ayton	5- 6-8	Concession late George Hume of Ayton	5- 6- 8
Ernislaw	Occupation by Sir David Hume	4- 0- 0				
Littlespot	Occupation by Archibald Dunbar	15- 0- 0				
Petcokkis	Occupation by Patrick Dunbar of Beil	20- 0- 0	Concession Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	20- 0- 0	Concession late Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	20- 0- 0
Forest of Dye	Occupation by Patrick Cockburn	10- 0- 0	Concession Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	10- 0- 0	Concession Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	10- 0- 0
Trafontanez	Occupation by Abbot of Dryburgh	13- 6- 8				
Lochton and Brighamschelis	Occupation by Sir Alex.Hume	40- 0- 0				
Lethame	Occupation by Sir David Hume	13- 6- 8				
Hardenis	Walter Spens alleged Hereditary Possession	6-13- 4				
	Payment Elizabeth, widow of Patrick Dunbar, by king's grace.	15- 0- 0				
			Fee of John Ramsey, Lord Bothwell as Keeper of Dunbar Castle	78- 0- 0		
Pinkerton			Concession Colin, earl of Argyll	50- 0- 0	Concession late Colin, earl of Argyll.	50- 0- 0
16 husbandlands of Duns			Concession Geo.Hume of Ayton	16- 0- 0	Concession late Geo.Hume of Ayton	16- 0- 0
Cottages of Duns			Concession John Hume	12- 0- 0	Concession Sir John Hume	12- 0- 0
20 husbandlands of Lethame & Mansion			Concession Alex. Hume	20- 0- 0	Concession Alex. Lord Hume	20- 0- 0
'le Voult'						
Mersington			Concession William Ker	20- 0- 0	Concession late William Ker (Concession by Alex. duke of Albany, confirmed by James III)	20- 0- 0

APPENDIX B/2

c) ALIENATION OF REVENUE FROM PORTIONS OF ROYAL DEMESNE IN VARIOUS TYPES OF PATRONAGE

a) EARLDOM OF MARCH

LAND	ER, vi, 333-338 1457	Annual Farm	ER, ix, 126-9 1488	Annual Farm	ER, viii, 465-7 1512	Annual Farm
Burgh Farms & Mills of Dunbar	Payment to 2 Chaplains at College of Dunbar	£ 20- 0- 0	Payment 2 Chaplains at College of Dunbar	£ 20- 0- 0	Concession 2 Chaplains at College of Dunbar	£ 20- 0- 0
Little Pinkerton and Newtown Leis	Assignation Robert Liddale for Fee as Keeper of Dunbar Castle	18-13- 4				
Ersiltown	Occuptation by William Cranstone of Corsby	50-17-10	Concession John Hume of Whiterig his alienation of earl of Angus	59-10- 0	Concession late Kentigern Hume	59- 0- 0
Greenlaw	Occupation by Thomas Cranstone	35-10- 0			Life Grant Roger Shoriswood, Hailes Pursuivant	6-13- 4
Duns	Occupation by Sir David Hume	18-18- 8				
Chirnside	Occupation by Air Alex. Hume	42-11-2	Concession Alexander Hume	32- 0- 0	Concession Alex. Lord Hume	42- 0- 0
Cadeschele	Occupation by Thomas Hume	5- 6- 8	Concession George Hume of Ayton	5- 6-8	Concession late George Hume of Ayton	5- 6- 8
Ernislaw	Occupation by Sir David Hume	4- 0- 0				
Littlespot	Occupation by Archibald Dunbar	15- 0- 0				
Petcokkis	Occupation by Patrick Dunbar of Beil	20- 0- 0	Concession Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	20- 0- 0	Concession late Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	20- 0- 0
Forest of Dye	Occupation by Patrick Cockburn	10- 0- 0	Concession Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	10- 0- 0	Concession Patrick, Earl of Bothwell	10- 0- 0
Trafontanez	Occupation by Abbot of Dryburgh	13- 6- 8				
Lochton and Brighamschelis	Occupation by Sir Alex.Hume	40- 0- 0				
Lethame	Occupation by Sir David Hume	13- 6- 8				
Hardenis	Walter Spens alleged Hereditary Possession	6-13- 4				
	Payment Elizabeth, widow of Patrick Dunbar, by king's grace.	15- 0- 0				
			Fee of John Ramsey, Lord Bothwell as Keeper of Dunbar Castle	78- 0- 0		
Pinkerton			Concession Colin, earl of Argyll	50- 0- 0	Concession late Colin, earl of Argyll.	50- 0- 0
16 husbandlands of Duns			Concession Geo.Hume of Ayton	16- 0- 0	Concession late Geo.Hume of Ayton	16- 0- 0
Cottages of Duns			Concession John Hume	12- 0- 0	Concession Sir John Hume	12- 0- 0
20 husbandlands of Lethame & Mansion			Concession Alex. Hume	20- 0- 0	Concession Alex. Lord Hume	20- 0- 0
'le Voult'						
Mersington			Concession William Ker	20- 0- 0	Concession late William Ker (Concession by Alex. duke of Albany, confirmed by James III)	20- 0- 0

	ER, vi, 333-338		ER, ix, 126-9			ER, viii, 465-7	
LAND	1457	Annual Farm	1488		Annual Farm	1512	Annual Farm
Mekle Drigham			Concession Alex. Bruce		£ 32- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Bruce	£ 32- 0- 0
Dunspark			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick		5- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	5- 0- 0
Prendirlathe			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick		5- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	5- 0- 0
6 husbandlands of Duns			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick		6- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	6- 0- 0
Lochbrigham			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick		20- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	20- 0- 0
Upsedlington			Concession Alex. Hume		10- 0- 0	Concession Alexander, Lord Hume	10- 0- 0
Todrig			Concession	John Hume of Whiterig	15- 0- 0	Concession Alexander, Lord Hume	15- 0- 0
Brighamschelis			Concession	Patrick Hume of Polworth	20- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Patrick Hume of Polworth	20- 0- 0
Cockburn						Fee Sir John Jume	20- 0- 0
	ALLOWANCES	£329- 4- 4			£455-16- 8		£414- 0- 0
	GROSS CHARGE	£576- 4-10			£633-13- 7		£582- 1- 7
	PERCENTAGE ALIENATION	57%			72%		71%

	ER, vi, 333-338		ER, ix, 126-9		ER, viii, 465-7	
LAND	1457	Annual Farm	1488	Annual Farm	1512	Annual Farm
Mekle Drigham			Concession Alex. Bruce	£ 32- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Bruce	£ 32- 0- 0
Dunspark			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	5- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	5- 0- 0
Prendirlathe			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	5- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	5- 0- 0
6 husbandlands of Duns			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	6- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	6- 0- 0
Lochbrigham			Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	20- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Alex. Kilpatrick	20- 0- 0
Upsedlington			Concession Alex. Hume	10- 0- 0	Concession Alexander, Lord Hume	10- 0- 0
Todrig			Concession John Hume of Whiterig	15- 0- 0	Concession Alexander, Lord Hume	15- 0- 0
Brighamschelis			Concession Patrick Hume of Polworth	20- 0- 0	Concession late Sir Patrick Hume of Polworth	20- 0- 0
Cockburn					Fee Sir John Jume	20- 0- 0
ALLOWANCES	£329- 4- 4		£455-16- 8		£414- 0- 0	
GROSS CHARGE	£576- 4-10		£633-13- 7		£582- 1- 7	
PERCENTAGE ALIENATION	57%		72%		71%	

APPENDIX B/2 — ARREARS TOTALS FROM BALLIVI AD EXTRA ACCOUNTS OF 1506

(ER, xii, 388-461)

d)

ACCOUNTANT	PROPERY	ARREARS IN CASH
Andrew Crichton	Linlithgowshire	£ 344-14-10
Alex. Lord Hume	Ettrick Forest	584-10- 6
Robert Rankin	Moray	Eque
Alex. Lord Hume	March	1,356- 4-11
Andrew Wood	Fettercairn	Eque
Andrew Ayton	Stirlingshire	Eque
Sir Alex. Irvine of Drum	Kintore	926- 7- 4
Thomas Wardroper	Kinclaven	1,114- 2- 4
Thomas Wardroper	Methven	215-10- 6
James Redheuch	Menteith	47- 4- 1
Sir John Ogilvy of Boyne	Petty and Blackley	17-19- 4
James Boyd of Corshill	Stewarton	191- 4- 0
Henry, Lord Sinclair	Orkney and Shetland	50-11- 0
Archibald, Earl of Argyll	Cowal and Rosneath	160- 0- 0
John, Lord Kennedy	Carrick	160-11- 6
William, Master of Errol	Brechin and Hevar	Eque
Ninian Stewart	Bute	Eque
Andrew, Bishop of Moray	Dunbar	Eque
James, Abbot of Dunfermline	Fife	84- 3- 5
Sir David Sinclair	Ross	Eque
Sir David Sinclair	Armeanach	78-15- 4
Patrick Scott	Strathearn	Eque
William Towis of Forres	Strathdon and Garioch	Eque
John Dunbar of Mochrum	Galloway	619-12- 8
	Total	£5,951-11- 9

ARREARS IN KIND					
WHEAT	BARLEY	OATS	SALMON	MARTS	MEAL
6C, 10B	1C, 2B	3C, 6B			
5C, 10B			11L, 7B		
			196		
8C, 11B	15C, 14B				
		11C		72	
			1000	40	
	20C	204C 5B			
				68	7C, 8B
	11C, 15B	10C		38	
3C, 3B	7C, 7B	6C, 3B			
	11C, 13B	14C, 7B		51	26C, 9B
	12C, 3B			84	3C, 13B
TOTALS					
24C, 2B	80C, 6B	249C, 5B	11C, 7B plus 1196 Salmon	353	37C, 14B

e) Details of the Accounts of the earldom of Fife. (ER Vols vi-xiii)

	1450-51	April 1451-53	April 1453-54	1454-55	1455-56	1456-57	1457-58	1458-59	1459-60	March 1461-62	1462-63	Martinmas 1463-64
Royal Property	£557-12- 9	£752- 3- 3	£ 916-19-11	£559-15- 5	£560-12- 5	£560-12-7	£560-12- 7	£579-17- 5	£593-12-10	£ 965-18- 1	£596- 6- 2	£225-13- 0
Gross charge for this Account	557-12- 9	874- 2- 3	1,059- 0- 1	674-11- 1	623-19- 1	560-12- 7	560-12- 7	664- 0- 9	598-12-10	1,406-13- 3	596- 6- 2	225-13- 0
Arrears	18- 3- 3	47- 6- 3	41-14- 5	51-19-1	12- 5- 8	36-10- 0	57- 5- 6	49- 9- 3	27- 6- 7	1-18- 3	50- 1-11	6-15- 0
Total Charge	575-16- 0	826-16- 0	1,017- 5- 8	622-12- 0	611- 3- 5	524- 2- 7	617-18-11	713-10- 1	625-19- 5	1,408-11- 6	646- 8- 1	232- 8- 8
Allowances for this Account	384-10- 8	494- 1- 3	505-13-11	245-18- 6	407- 6- 8	185-17- 1	324- 2- 3	322- 4- 6	363- 9- 5	841- 0- 7	187-12- 4	96-14- 6
Total Allowances	384-10- 8	494- 1- 3	505-13-11	245-18- 6	407- 6- 8	185-17- 1	369-12- 8	322- 4- 6	363- 9- 5	841- 0- 7	192- 1- 4	96-14- 6
Profit	191- 5- 4	332-14- 9	511-11- 9	376-13- 6	203-16- 9	338- 5- 6	248- 5- 5	391- 5- 7	262-10- 0	567-10-11	454- 6- 9	135-14- 2
Real Revenue	238-11- 7	374- 9- 2	573-10-10	389- 9- 2	240 -6-10	281- 0- 0	198-16- 2	363-19- 0	272- 8-11	517- 0- 9	447-11- 1	130- 7-10
Balance	47- 6- 3	41-14- 5	51-19- 1	12- 5- 8	36-10- 1	57- 5- 6	49- 9- 3	27- 6- 7	9-18-11	50- 1-11	6-15- 8	5- 6- 4
Value per Annum	173- 2- 1	380- 1 -0	553- 6- 2	433-12- 7	216-12- 5	374-15- 6	236-10- 4	321-16- 3	235- 3- 5	565-12- 8	408-13-10	128-18- 6

	Whitsun 1464	1464-65	1465-66	1466-67	1467-68	1468-69	1470-71	1472-73	1473-74	1474-75	1475-76	1476-77
Royal Property	£374-19- 4	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£599- 9- 2	£599- 9- 2	£599- 9- 2	£599- 9- 2
Gross Charge for this Account	374-19- 4	786-15- 5	598-15-10	875- 2- 0	598-15-10	598-15-10	992- 4- 2	798-15-10	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2
Arrears	-	100- 0- 0	19- 5- 1	2- 8- 5	116-14- 0	2-10-11	91- 8- 7	30- 6- 9	-	-	-	74- 0- 8
Total Charges	374-19- 4	886-15- 5	618- 1- 0	877-10- 5	482- 1-10	601- 6-10	900-15- 5	829- 2- 8	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	525- 8- 6
Allowances for this Account	105-13-11	282- 2- 6	266- 2- 4	462-12- 7	236-17- 4	156- 4- 3	134- 2- 4	206-13- 3	277- 6- 8	388-18- 0	330- 0- 8	248- 6- 7
Total Allowances	105-13-11	282- 2- 6	266- 2- 4	462-12- 7	236-17- 4	161-17- 7	207- 2- 4	206-13- 3	277- 6- 8	388-18- 0	330- 0- 8	248- 6- 7
Profit	269- 5- 5	604-12-11	351-18- 8	414-17-10	245- 4- 6	439- 9- 3	693-13- 1	622- 9- 5	322- 2- 6	210-11- 2	269- 8- 6	277- 1-11
Real Revenue	169- 5- 5	585- 7-10	349-10- 3	531-11-10	243- 3- 7	457-14- 7	664- 6- 5	579- 9- 5	318- 9- 2	206-17-10	339-15-10	319- 0- 2
Balance	100- 0- 0	19- 5- 1	2- 8- 5	116-14- 0	2- 0-11	18- 5- 4	-	-	-	-	74- 0- 8	41-18- 3
Value per Annum	269- 5- 5	504-12-11	332-13- 6	412- 9- 5	361-18- 6	442-11- 7	858- 1-10	592- 2- 7	322- 2- 6	210-11- 2	269- 8- 6	351- 2- 7

e) Details of the Accounts of the earldom of Fife. (ER Vols vi-xiii)

	1450-51	April 1451-53	April 1453-54	1454-55	1455-56	1456-57	1457-58	1458-59	1459-60	March 1461-62	1462-63	Martinmas 1463-64
Royal Property	£557-12- 9	£752- 3- 3	£ 916-19-11	£559-15- 5	£560-12- 5	£560-12-7	£560-12- 7	£579-17- 5	£593-12-10	£ 965-18- 1	£596- 6- 2	£225-13- 0
Gross charge for this Account	557-12- 9	874- 2- 3	1,059- 0- 1	674-11- 1	623-19- 1	560-12- 7	560-12- 7	664- 0- 9	598-12-10	1,406-13- 3	596- 6- 2	225-13- 0
Arrears	18- 3- 3	47- 6- 3	41-14- 5	51-19-1	12- 5- 8	36-10- 0	57- 5- 6	49- 9- 3	27- 6- 7	1-18- 3	50- 1-11	6-15- 0
Total Charge	575-16- 0	826-16- 0	1,017- 5- 8	622-12- 0	611- 3- 5	524- 2- 7	617-18-11	713-10- 1	625-19- 5	1,408-11- 6	646- 8- 1	232- 8- 8
Allowances for this Account	384-10- 8	494- 1- 3	505-13-11	245-18- 6	407- 6- 8	185-17- 1	324- 2- 3	322- 4- 6	363- 9- 5	841- 0- 7	187-12- 4	96-14- 6
Total Allowances	384-10- 8	494- 1- 3	505-13-11	245-18- 6	407- 6- 8	185-17- 1	369-12- 8	322- 4- 6	363- 9- 5	841- 0- 7	192- 1- 4	96-14- 6
Profit	191- 5- 4	332-14- 9	511-11- 9	376-13- 6	203-16- 9	338- 5- 6	248- 5- 5	391- 5- 7	262-10- 0	567-10-11	454- 6- 9	135-14- 2
Real Revenue	238-11- 7	374- 9- 2	573-10-10	389- 9- 2	240 -6-10	281- 0- 0	198-16- 2	363-19- 0	272- 8-11	517- 0- 9	447-11- 1	130- 7-10
Balance	47- 6- 3	41-14- 5	51-19- 1	12- 5- 8	36-10- 1	57- 5- 6	49- 9- 3	27- 6- 7	9-18-11	50- 1-11	6-15- 8	5- 6- 4
Value per Annum	173- 2- 1	380- 1 -0	553- 6- 2	433-12- 7	216-12- 5	374-15- 6	236-10- 4	321-16- 3	235- 3- 5	565-12- 8	408-13-10	128-18- 6

	Whitsun 1464	1464-65	1465-66	1466-67	1467-68	1468-69	1470-71	1472-73	1473-74	1474-75	1475-76	1476-77
Royal Property	£374-19- 4	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£598-15-10	£599- 9- 2	£599- 9- 2	£599- 9- 2	£599- 9- 2
Gross Charge for this Account	374-19- 4	786-15- 5	598-15-10	875- 2- 0	598-15-10	598-15-10	992- 4- 2	798-15-10	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2
Arrears	-	100- 0- 0	19- 5- 1	2- 8- 5	116-14- 0	2-10-11	91- 8- 7	30- 6- 9	-	-	-	74- 0- 8
Total Charges	374-19- 4	886-15- 5	618- 1- 0	877-10- 5	482- 1-10	601- 6-10	900-15- 5	829- 2- 8	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	599- 9- 2	525- 8- 6
Allowances for this Account	105-13-11	282- 2- 6	266- 2- 4	462-12- 7	236-17- 4	156- 4- 3	134- 2- 4	206-13- 3	277- 6- 8	388-18- 0	330- 0- 8	248- 6- 7
Total Allowances	105-13-11	282- 2- 6	266- 2- 4	462-12- 7	236-17- 4	161-17- 7	207- 2- 4	206-13- 3	277- 6- 8	388-18- 0	330- 0- 8	248- 6- 7
Profit	269- 5- 5	604-12-11	351-18- 8	414-17-10	245- 4- 6	439- 9- 3	693-13- 1	622- 9- 5	322- 2- 6	210-11- 2	269- 8- 6	277- 1-11
Real Revenue	169- 5- 5	585- 7-10	349-10- 3	531-11-10	243- 3- 7	457-14- 7	664- 6- 5	579- 9- 5	318- 9- 2	206-17-10	339-15-10	319- 0- 2
Balance	100- 0- 0	19- 5- 1	2- 8- 5	116-14- 0	2- 0-11	18- 5- 4	-	-	-	-	74- 0- 8	41-18- 3
Value per Annum	269- 5- 5	504-12-11	332-13- 6	412- 9- 5	361-18- 6	442-11- 7	858- 1-10	592- 2- 7	322- 2- 6	210-11- 2	269- 8- 6	351- 2- 7

	1477-78	1478-79	1479-80	1480-81	1481-82	1483-84	1484-85	1485-86	1486-87	1487-88	1488-89	1489-90
Royal Property	£601- 3-11	£621- 8-11	£608- 2- 3	£608- 2- 3	£608- 2- 3	£612-17- 3	£612-17- 3	£ 606-17- 3	£ 632-12- 1	£ 632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	£632-12- 1
Gross Charge for this Account	843-16- 2	647- 2- 3	663-12- 3	626- 8-11	608- 2- 3	612-17- 3	618- 3-11	1,244- 1- 3	955- 6-11	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1
Arrears	41-18- 3	28-17- 4	27-10- 1	25-17- 9	115- 6- 2	22-14- 2	-	-	954- 3- 4	637- 0-11	-	153- 5-10
Total Charge	801-17-11	676-19- 7	691- 2- 5	652- 6- 8	724- 8- 6	590- 3- 1	618- 3-11	1,244- 1- 3	1,909-10- 3	1,269-13- 1	632-12- 1	685-18- 0
Allowances for this Account	206-10- 1	234- 6- 8	223- 1- 4	162- 6- 8	167-15- 8	124- 2- 4		251- 4- 7	360- 0-10	241- 3- 7	222-13- 6	324-19- 0
Total Allowances	206-10- 1	234- 6- 8	223- 1- 4	162- 6- 8	181- 2- 4	142-15- 8		251- 4- 7	439- 5- 2	241- 3- 7	248- 8- 4	421-10- 0
Profit	595- 7-10	434-19- 7	468- 1- 1	490- 0- 0	543- 6- 2	447- 7- 5		992-16- 8	1,470- 5- 1	372-12- 6	384- 3- 9	364- 8- 0
Real Revenue	566-10- 6	403-16- 2	442- 3- 4	374-13-10	436- 5- 2	447- 7- 5		38-13- 4	796-10-10	369- 5-10	230-17-11	357- 1- 4
Balance	28-17- 4	27 -10- 1	25-17- 9	115- 6- 2	170- 1- 0	-		954- 3- 4	637- 0-11	-	153- 5-10	-
Value per Annum	637- 6- 1	413-15- 7	440-10-11	464- 2- 3	440- 6- 7	488-14-11		992-16- 8	595- 6- 1	391- 8- 6	409-18- 7	297-13- 1

NO DISCHARGE

	1490-91	1491-92	1493-94	1494-95	1495-96	1496-97	1497-98	1498-99	1499-1501	1501-02	1502-03	1503-04
Royal Property	£632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	£1,225-14- 7	£610- 3- 3	£610- 3- 3	£610- 3- 3
Gross Charge for this Account	953-19- 3	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	934- 9- 7	632-12- 1	659- 5- 5	783-14-10	1,422- 0- 1	1,078- 0- 2	618- 7-11	668- 4- 8
Arrears	-	221- 0- 7	135-13- 8	211-18-11	295-3- 4	184- 7- 6	148- 2- 4	194-17- 5	-	201- 6-11	584- 2- 8	-
Total Charge	953-19- 3	853-12- 9	768- 5-10	844-11- 0	1,229-14- 0	816-19- 8	807- 7- 9	978-12- 3	1,422- 0- 1	1,279- 7- 1	1,202-10- 8	668- 4- 8
Allowances for this Account	257-10-10	248- 1- 8	242- 0- 0	224- 9- 0	353- 0- 1	358-15- 8	240-19- 8	273- 8- 4	420-16-10	156-14- 2	150-12- 1	175- 6-10
Total Allowances	257-10-10	248- 1- 8	242- 0-0	264- 9- 0	482-13- 5	378-15- 8	240-19- 8	341-10- 0	420-16-10	165- 2-10	185- 9- 9	177- 6-10
Profit	696- 8- 5	605-11- 1	526- 5-10	580- 2- 0	747- 0- 7	438- 4- 0	566- 8- 1	637- 2- 3	1,001- 3- 3	1,114- 4- 3	1,017- 0-11	490-17-10
Real Revenue	475- 7-10	250-17- 2	314- 6-11	284-18- 8	532-13- 1	290- 1- 8	371-10- 8	436- 5- 0	799-16- 4	530- 1- 7	638- 0- 5	490-17-10
Balance	221- 0- 7	354-13-11	211-18-11	295- 3- 4	184- 7- 6	148- 2- 4	194-17- 5	200-17- 3	201- 6-11	584- 2- 8	334- 0- 6	-
Value per Annum	696- 8- 5	384-10- 5	390-12- 1	408- 3- 1	581- 9- 6	273-16- 5	418- 5- 9	510- 6- 6	1,001- 3- 3	921- 6- 0	467-15-10	492-17-10

	1504-05	1505-06	1506-07	1507-08	1508-09	1509-10	1511-12	1512-13
Royal Property	£ 613- 9-11	£613- 9-11	618- 9-11	613- 9-11	618- 9-11	618- 9-11	970- 7- 1	966- 7- 1
Gross Charge for this Account	1,057-15- 8	662-11- 2	613- 9-11	986-19- 7	630-9-11	1,390-18- 7	1,106- 0- 5	966- 7- 1
Arrears	-	440- 5- 8	84- 3- 5	-	373- 9- 8	116- 9- 6	617- 5-10	350- 6-10
Total Charge	1,057-15- 8	1,102-16-11	697-13- 5	986-19- 7	1,003-19- 7	1,512- 8- 6	1,723- 6- 3	1,316-13-11
Allowances for this Account	149-15-11	158-17- 9	157-15- 4	171-18- 8	157- 6- 8	173-10- 8	484-13-11	452-16- 8
Total Allowances	149-15-11	236- 4- 5	243- 2- 0	171-18- 8	182- 1- 5	202- 8- 9	860- 0-11	456-16- 8
Profit	907-19- 9	866-12- 6	454-11- 5	815- 0-11	821-18- 2	1,309-19- 9	863- 5- 4	859-17- 3
Real Revenue	467-14- 1	782- 9- 1	454-11- 5	441-11- 3	705- 8- 4	542- 6- 5	512-18- 6	639-15- 5
Balance	440- 5- 8	84- 3- 5	-	373- 9- 8	116- 9-10	767-13- 4	350- 6-10	220- 1-10
Value per annum	907-19- 9	503-13- 5	455-14- 7	815- 0-11	473- 3- 3	1,217- 7-11	621- 6- 6	513-10- 5

	1477-78	1478-79	1479-80	1480-81	1481-82	1483-84	1484-85	1485-86	1486-87	1487-88	1488-89	1489-90
Royal Property	£601- 3-11	£621- 8-11	£608- 2- 3	£608- 2- 3	£608- 2- 3	£612-17- 3	£612-17- 3	£ 606-17- 3	£ 632-12- 1	£ 632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	£632-12- 1
Gross Charge for this Account	843-16- 2	647- 2- 3	663-12- 3	626- 8-11	608- 2- 3	612-17- 3	618- 3-11	1,244- 1- 3	955- 6-11	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1
Arrears	41-18- 3	28-17- 4	27-10- 1	25-17- 9	115- 6- 2	22-14- 2	-	-	954- 3- 4	637- 0-11	-	153- 5-10
Total Charge	801-17-11	676-19- 7	691- 2- 5	652- 6- 8	724- 8- 6	590- 3- 1	618- 3-11	1,244- 1- 3	1,909-10- 3	1,269-13- 1	632-12- 1	685-18- 0
Allowances for this Account	206-10- 1	234- 6- 8	223- 1- 4	162- 6- 8	167-15- 8	124- 2- 4		251- 4- 7	360- 0-10	241- 3- 7	222-13- 6	324-19- 0
Total Allowances	206-10- 1	234- 6- 8	223- 1- 4	162- 6- 8	181- 2- 4	142-15- 8		251- 4- 7	439- 5- 2	241- 3- 7	248- 8- 4	421-10- 0
Profit	595- 7-10	434-19- 7	468- 1- 1	490- 0- 0	543- 6- 2	447- 7- 5		992-16- 8	1,470- 5- 1	372-12- 6	384- 3- 9	364- 8- 0
Real Revenue	566-10- 6	403-16- 2	442- 3- 4	374-13-10	436- 5- 2	447- 7- 5		38-13- 4	796-10-10	369- 5-10	230-17-11	357- 1- 4
Balance	28-17- 4	27 -10- 1	25-17- 9	115- 6- 2	170- 1- 0	-		954- 3- 4	637- 0-11	-	153- 5-10	-
Value per Annum	637- 6- 1	413-15- 7	440-10-11	464- 2- 3	440- 6- 7	488-14-11		992-16- 8	595- 6- 1	391- 8- 6	409-18- 7	297-13- 1

NO DISCHARGE

	1490-91	1491-92	1493-94	1494-95	1495-96	1496-97	1497-98	1498-99	1499-1501	1501-02	1502-03	1503-04
Royal Property	£632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	£632-12- 1	£1,225-14- 7	£610- 3- 3	£610- 3- 3	£610- 3- 3
Gross Charge for this Account	953-19- 3	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	632-12- 1	934- 9- 7	632-12- 1	659- 5- 5	783-14-10	1,422- 0- 1	1,078- 0- 2	618- 7-11	668- 4- 8
Arrears	-	221- 0- 7	135-13- 8	211-18-11	295-3- 4	184- 7- 6	148- 2- 4	194-17- 5	-	201- 6-11	584- 2- 8	-
Total Charge	953-19- 3	853-12- 9	768- 5-10	844-11- 0	1,229-14- 0	816-19- 8	807- 7- 9	978-12- 3	1,422- 0- 1	1,279- 7- 1	1,202-10- 8	668- 4- 8
Allowances for this Account	257-10-10	248- 1- 8	242- 0- 0	224- 9- 0	353- 0- 1	358-15- 8	240-19- 8	273- 8- 4	420-16-10	156-14- 2	150-12- 1	175- 6-10
Total Allowances	257-10-10	248- 1- 8	242- 0-0	264- 9- 0	482-13- 5	378-15- 8	240-19- 8	341-10- 0	420-16-10	165- 2-10	185- 9- 9	177- 6-10
Profit	696- 8- 5	605-11- 1	526- 5-10	580- 2- 0	747- 0- 7	438- 4- 0	566- 8- 1	637- 2- 3	1,001- 3- 3	1,114- 4- 3	1,017- 0-11	490-17-10
Real Revenue	475- 7-10	250-17- 2	314- 6-11	284-18- 8	532-13- 1	290- 1- 8	371-10- 8	436- 5- 0	799-16- 4	530- 1- 7	638- 0- 5	490-17-10
Balance	221- 0- 7	354-13-11	211-18-11	295- 3- 4	184- 7- 6	148- 2- 4	194-17- 5	200-17- 3	201- 6-11	584- 2- 8	334- 0- 6	-
Value per Annum	696- 8- 5	384-10- 5	390-12- 1	408- 3- 1	581- 9- 6	273-16- 5	418- 5- 9	510- 6- 6	1,001- 3- 3	921- 6- 0	467-15-10	492-17-10

	1504-05	1505-06	1506-07	1507-08	1508-09	1509-10	1511-12	1512-13
Royal Property	£ 613- 9-11	£613- 9-11	618- 9-11	613- 9-11	618- 9-11	618- 9-11	970- 7- 1	966- 7- 1
Gross Charge for this Account	1,057-15- 8	662-11- 2	613- 9-11	986-19- 7	630-9-11	1,390-18- 7	1,106- 0- 5	966- 7- 1
Arrears	-	440- 5- 8	84- 3- 5	-	373- 9- 8	116- 9- 6	617- 5-10	350- 6-10
Total Charge	1,057-15- 8	1,102-16-11	697-13- 5	986-19- 7	1,003-19- 7	1,512- 8- 6	1,723- 6- 3	1,316-13-11
Allowances for this Account	149-15-11	158-17- 9	157-15- 4	171-18- 8	157- 6- 8	173-10- 8	484-13-11	452-16- 8
Total Allowances	149-15-11	236- 4- 5	243- 2- 0	171-18- 8	182- 1- 5	202- 8- 9	860- 0-11	456-16- 8
Profit	907-19- 9	866-12- 6	454-11- 5	815- 0-11	821-18- 2	1,309-19- 9	863- 5- 4	859-17- 3
Real Revenue	467-14- 1	782- 9- 1	454-11- 5	441-11- 3	705- 8- 4	542- 6- 5	512-18- 6	639-15- 5
Balance	440- 5- 8	84- 3- 5	-	373- 9- 8	116- 9-10	767-13- 4	350- 6-10	220- 1-10
Value per annum	907-19- 9	503-13- 5	455-14- 7	815- 0-11	473- 3- 3	1,217- 7-11	621- 6- 6	513-10- 5

. f) Details of Accounts of the 3 Wards of Ettrick Forest and Glencairny. (ER, Vols ox-xiii)

THREE WARDS OF ETTRICK FOREST

	February 1500-01	1501-02	1502-03	1503-04	1504-05	1505-06	1506-07	1507-08
Gross Charge for this Account	£706- 8- 9	£2,670- 3- 3	£2,670- 3- 3	£2,684- 3- 3	£2,680- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4
Arrears	-	238-11- 5	548-19-11	-	736- 7- 4	545-14-11	584-10- 6	-
Total Charge	706- 8- 9	2,908-14- 9	3,219- 3- 3	2,684- 3- 3	3,416-10- 8	3,215-18- 3	3,254-13-10	2,670- 3- 4
Allowances for this Account	99-13- 4	1,586-13- 4	1,168-13- 5	638-15- 5	1,102- 4- 7	1,039-11-11	971-12-11	1,185-18- 7
Total Allowances	99-13- 4	1,586-13- 4	1,244-13- 5	638-15- 5	1,352- 4- 7	1,109-11-10	1,626- 3- 5	1,185-18- 7
Profit	606-15- 5	1,322- 1- 5	1,974- 9-10	2,045- 7-10	2,064- 6- 1	2,106- 6- 4	1,628-10- 5	2,484- 4- 9
Real Revenue	525-19- 0	773- 1- 6	1,974- 9-10	1,309- 0- 6	1,518-11- 2	1,521-15-10	1,628-10- 5	2,452- 4- 9
Balance	238-11- 5	548-19-11	-	736- 7- 4	545-14-11	584-10- 6	-	32- 0- 0
Value per Annum	606-15- 5	1,083- 9-11	1,501- 9-10	2,045- 7-10	1,577-18- 9	1,630-11- 5	1,698-10- 5	2,484- 4- 9

	1508-09	1509-10	1510-11	1511-12	1512-13
Gross Charge for this Account	£2,670- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4		£2,984-16- 3	£2,672-16- 8
Arrears	-	-		1,072- 3-9	632-15- 8
Total Charge	2,670- 3- 4	2,670- 3- 4		4,057- 0- 5	3,305-12- 4
Allowance for this Account	955-12- 0	839-10- 0		1,029- 7- 4	845- 7- 4
Total Allowances	955-12- 0	839-10- 0		1,748-10- 0	1,095-17- 4
Profit	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4		2,308-10- 5	2,209-15- 0
Real Revenue	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4		1,675-14- 9	1,601- 2-11
Balance	-	-		632-15- 8	608-12- 1
Value per Annum	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4		1,955- 9- 4	1,827- 9- 4

. f) Details of Accounts of the 3 Wards of Ettrick Forest and Glencairny. (ER, Vols ox-xiii)

THREE WARDS OF ETTRICK FOREST

	February 1500-01	1501-02	1502-03	1503-04	1504-05	1505-06	1506-07	1507-08
Gross Charge for this Account	£706- 8- 9	£2,670- 3- 3	£2,670- 3- 3	£2,684- 3- 3	£2,680- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4
Arrears	-	238-11- 5	548-19-11	-	736- 7- 4	545-14-11	584-10- 6	-
Total Charge	706- 8- 9	2,908-14- 9	3,219- 3- 3	2,684- 3- 3	3,416-10- 8	3,215-18- 3	3,254-13-10	2,670- 3- 4
Allowances for this Account	99-13- 4	1,586-13- 4	1,168-13- 5	638-15- 5	1,102- 4- 7	1,039-11-11	971-12-11	1,185-18- 7
Total Allowances	99-13- 4	1,586-13- 4	1,244-13- 5	638-15- 5	1,352- 4- 7	1,109-11-10	1,626- 3- 5	1,185-18- 7
Profit	606-15- 5	1,322- 1- 5	1,974- 9-10	2,045- 7-10	2,064- 6- 1	2,106- 6- 4	1,628-10- 5	2,484- 4- 9
Real Revenue	525-19- 0	773- 1- 6	1,974- 9-10	1,309- 0- 6	1,518-11- 2	1,521-15-10	1,628-10- 5	2,452- 4- 9
Balance	238-11- 5	548-19-11	-	736- 7- 4	545-14-11	584-10- 6	-	32- 0- 0
Value per Annum	606-15- 5	1,083- 9-11	1,501- 9-10	2,045- 7-10	1,577-18- 9	1,630-11- 5	1,698-10- 5	2,484- 4- 9

	1508-09	1509-10	1510-11	1511-12	1512-13
Gross Charge for this Account	£2,670- 3- 4	£2,670- 3- 4		£2,984-16- 3	£2,672-16- 8
Arrears	-	-		1,072- 3-9	632-15- 8
Total Charge	2,670- 3- 4	2,670- 3- 4		4,057- 0- 5	3,305-12- 4
Allowance for this Account	955-12- 0	839-10- 0		1,029- 7- 4	845- 7- 4
Total Allowances	955-12- 0	839-10- 0		1,748-10- 0	1,095-17- 4
Profit	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4		2,308-10- 5	2,209-15- 0
Real Revenue	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4		1,675-14- 9	1,601- 2-11
Balance	-	-		632-15- 8	608-12- 1
Value per Annum	1,714-11- 4	1,730-13- 4		1,955- 9- 4	1,827- 9- 4

. *GLENCAIRNY*

	4 Terms 1505-07	1507-08	1508-09	1509-10	4 Terms 1511-13
Gross Charge for this Account	£500- 0- 0	£258- 0- 0	£258- 0- 0	£255- 0- 0	£510- 0- 0
Arrears	-	-	-	-	24- 0- 0
Total Charge	500- 0- 0	258- 0- 0	258- 0- 0	255- 0- 0	534- 0- 0
Allowances for this Account	126- 0- 0	67- 0- 0	67- 0- 0	63-10- 0	126- 0- 0
Total Allowances	126- 0- 0	67- 0- 0	67- 0- 0	63-10- 0	126- 0- 0
Profit	374- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191-10- 0	408- 0- 0
Real Revenue	382- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191-10- 0	384- 0- 0
Balance	8- 0- 0	-	-	-	24- 0- 0
Value per Annum	374- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191- 0- 0	191-10- 0	384- 0- 0

. g) DETAILS OF ACCOUNTS OF LINLITHGOWSHIRE (ER, Vols. vi-xiii)

Lordship of Linlithgowshire

	1450-51	3 Terms 1541-52	1 Term 1452-53	4 Terms 1453-54	1454-56	1456-57	1457-58	1458-59	Martinmas 1460-61	1463-64	1464-65	1465-66	4 Terms 1466-68
Royal Property	£ 83-16-10	£125-15- 3	£ 42-11- 5	£ 83-16-10	£280-19- 8	£140-17- 8	£140-17- 8	£140-17- 8	£169- 3- 8	£166- 4- 6	£180-16-10	£182- 6-10	£364- 5- 4
Gross Charge for this Account	83-16-10	203-10- 3	42-11- 5	94-17- 4	280-19- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	171- 4- 1	170-13- 4	184- 5- 8	238- 2-10	399- 8- 1
Arrears	10-10- 0	1-11- 1	46- 4- 6	30- 5- 3	4-13- 4	10- 0- 5	14-14- 7	25- 6- 0	2- 6- 0	-	22- 0- 0	22-11- 5	58-16- 9
Total Charge	96- 6-10	205- 1- 4	88-15-11	124- 3- 0	285-13- 0	150-18 -1	155-12- 3	166- 3- 8	173-10- 1	170-18- 4	206- 5- 8	260-14- 3	458- 4-10
Allowances for this Account	22-16- 8	93-17-11	14- 9- 1	28-18-10	211- 5- 2	76-11- 1	45- 5- 9	40-11- 2	35- 8- 6	32- 6- 4	112- 6- 7	132- 1- 9	204-11- 1
Total Allowances	22-16- 8	93-17-11	29- 1- 9	28-18-10	211- 5- 2	86-11- 1	51-19- 1	40-11- 2	35- 8- 7	32- 6- 4	112-18- 3	132- 1- 9	205- 5- 1
Profit	71-10- 2	111- 3- 5	59- 4- 2	95- 4- 2	74- 7-10	64- 7- 0	103-13- 2	115-12- 6	138- 1- 5	138- 7- 0	93- 7- 5	128-12- 6	252- 9- 9
Real Revenue	70- 9- 1	64-19- 3	29- 8- 6	54-18- 2	64- 7- 5	49-12- 8	78- 7- 2	50-14-10	152-13- 9	116- 7- 0	70-16- 0	81-15- 9	85-18- 4
Balance	1-11- 1	46- 4- 2	30- 5- 8	4-13- 4	10- 0- 5	14-14- 7	25- 6- 0	64-17- 8	14-12- 4	22- 0- 0	22-11- 5	46-16- 9	166-11- 5
Value per Annum	61- 0- 2	109-12- 4	28-2 - 4	65-18- 6	69-14- 6	64- 6- 7	105-11-11	100- 6- 6	135-15- 7	130- 7- 0	71-19- 1	106- 1- 1	194-17- 0

	1468-69	1470-71	1472-73	1473-74	1474-75	1475-76	1476-77	1477-78	1478-79	1479-80	1480-81	1481-82	1483-84
Royal Property	£186- 2- 8	£191-10- 2	£171-10- 2	£167- 3- 6	£167- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£178-10- 2
Gross Charge for this Account	192-16- 0	235- 4- 6	171-10- 2	167- 3- 6	167- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	218-10- 2	190-13- 3	177- 3- 6	185- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	191-16-10
Arrears	-	40- 6- 7	-	-	-	-	-	5- 6- 8	-	3- 7- 2	44- 7- 6	19-18- 0	-
Total Charge	192-16- 0	275-11- 1	171-10- 2	167- 3- 6	167- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	218-10- 2	195-19-11	177- 3- 6	188-10- 6	221-11- 0	197- 1- 6	191-16-10
Allowances for this Account	118- 0- 9	118-15- 4	118-10- 2	121-16-10	123-12- 6	145- 3- 6	129- 1- 0	168-19- 8	113-16- 4	114-19- 8	131-13- 0	103-19- 8	156-17- 7
Total Allowances	118- 0- 9	121-18- 0	118-10- 2	121-16-10	123-12- 6	145- 3- 6	129- 1- 0	174- 6- 4	113-16- 4	116-19- 8	171-13- 0	130-13- 0	156-17-7
Profit	74-15- 3	153-13- 1	53- 0- 0	40- 0- 0	43-11- 0	32- 0- 0	89- 9- 2	21-13- 7	53- 7- 2	71-10-10	49-18- 0	66- 8- 6	34-19- 3
Real Revenue	48-18- 8	83- 5- 5	53- 0- 0	40- 0- 0	43-11- 0	32- 0- 0	84- 2- 6	21-13- 7	50- 0- 0	27- 3- 4	30- 0- 0	28-12- 9	31-14- 0
Balance	25-16- 7	40- 7- 8	-	-	-	-	5- 6- 8	-	3- 7- 2	44- 7- 6	19-18- 0	37-15- 9	3- 5- 3
Value perAnnum	74-15- 3	116-19- 2	53- 0- 0	40- 0- 0	43-11- 0	82- 0- 0	89- 9- 2	21-13- 7	53- 7- 2	70- 3-10	45-10- 6	73- 3-10	34-19- 3

. g) DETAILS OF ACCOUNTS OF LINLITHGOWSHIRE (ER, Vols. vi-xiii)

Lordship of Linlithgowshire

	1450-51	3 Terms 1541-52	1 Term 1452-53	4 Terms 1453-54	1454-56	1456-57	1457-58	1458-59	Martinmas 1460-61	1463-64	1464-65	1465-66	4 Terms 1466-68
Royal Property	£ 83-16-10	£125-15- 3	£ 42-11- 5	£ 83-16-10	£280-19- 8	£140-17- 8	£140-17- 8	£140-17- 8	£169- 3- 8	£166- 4- 6	£180-16-10	£182- 6-10	£364- 5- 4
Gross Charge for this Account	83-16-10	203-10- 3	42-11- 5	94-17- 4	280-19- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	140-17- 8	171- 4- 1	170-13- 4	184- 5- 8	238- 2-10	399- 8- 1
Arrears	10-10- 0	1-11- 1	46- 4- 6	30- 5- 3	4-13- 4	10- 0- 5	14-14- 7	25- 6- 0	2- 6- 0	-	22- 0- 0	22-11- 5	58-16- 9
Total Charge	96- 6-10	205- 1- 4	88-15-11	124- 3- 0	285-13- 0	150-18 -1	155-12- 3	166- 3- 8	173-10- 1	170-18- 4	206- 5- 8	260-14- 3	458- 4-10
Allowances for this Account	22-16- 8	93-17-11	14- 9- 1	28-18-10	211- 5- 2	76-11- 1	45- 5- 9	40-11- 2	35- 8- 6	32- 6- 4	112- 6- 7	132- 1- 9	204-11- 1
Total Allowances	22-16- 8	93-17-11	29- 1- 9	28-18-10	211- 5- 2	86-11- 1	51-19- 1	40-11- 2	35- 8- 7	32- 6- 4	112-18- 3	132- 1- 9	205- 5- 1
Profit	71-10- 2	111- 3- 5	59- 4- 2	95- 4- 2	74- 7-10	64- 7- 0	103-13- 2	115-12- 6	138- 1- 5	138- 7- 0	93- 7- 5	128-12- 6	252- 9- 9
Real Revenue	70- 9- 1	64-19- 3	29- 8- 6	54-18- 2	64- 7- 5	49-12- 8	78- 7- 2	50-14-10	152-13- 9	116- 7- 0	70-16- 0	81-15- 9	85-18- 4
Balance	1-11- 1	46- 4- 2	30- 5- 8	4-13- 4	10- 0- 5	14-14- 7	25- 6- 0	64-17- 8	14-12- 4	22- 0- 0	22-11- 5	46-16- 9	166-11- 5
Value per Annum	61- 0- 2	109-12- 4	28-2 - 4	65-18- 6	69-14- 6	64- 6- 7	105-11-11	100- 6- 6	135-15- 7	130- 7- 0	71-19- 1	106- 1- 1	194-17- 0

	1468-69	1470-71	1472-73	1473-74	1474-75	1475-76	1476-77	1477-78	1478-79	1479-80	1480-81	1481-82	1483-84
Royal Property	£186- 2- 8	£191-10- 2	£171-10- 2	£167- 3- 6	£167- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£177- 3- 6	£178-10- 2
Gross Charge for this Account	192-16- 0	235- 4- 6	171-10- 2	167- 3- 6	167- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	218-10- 2	190-13- 3	177- 3- 6	185- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	191-16-10
Arrears	-	40- 6- 7	-	-	-	-	-	5- 6- 8	-	3- 7- 2	44- 7- 6	19-18- 0	-
Total Charge	192-16- 0	275-11- 1	171-10- 2	167- 3- 6	167- 3- 6	177- 3- 6	218-10- 2	195-19-11	177- 3- 6	188-10- 6	221-11- 0	197- 1- 6	191-16-10
Allowances for this Account	118- 0- 9	118-15- 4	118-10- 2	121-16-10	123-12- 6	145- 3- 6	129- 1- 0	168-19- 8	113-16- 4	114-19- 8	131-13- 0	103-19- 8	156-17- 7
Total Allowances	118- 0- 9	121-18- 0	118-10- 2	121-16-10	123-12- 6	145- 3- 6	129- 1- 0	174- 6- 4	113-16- 4	116-19- 8	171-13- 0	130-13- 0	156-17-7
Profit	74-15- 3	153-13- 1	53- 0- 0	40- 0- 0	43-11- 0	32- 0- 0	89- 9- 2	21-13- 7	53- 7- 2	71-10-10	49-18- 0	66- 8- 6	34-19- 3
Real Revenue	48-18- 8	83- 5- 5	53- 0- 0	40- 0- 0	43-11- 0	32- 0- 0	84- 2- 6	21-13- 7	50- 0- 0	27- 3- 4	30- 0- 0	28-12- 9	31-14- 0
Balance	25-16- 7	40- 7- 8	-	-	-	-	5- 6- 8	-	3- 7- 2	44- 7- 6	19-18- 0	37-15- 9	3- 5- 3
Value perAnnum	74-15- 3	116-19- 2	53- 0- 0	40- 0- 0	43-11- 0	82- 0- 0	89- 9- 2	21-13- 7	53- 7- 2	70- 3-10	45-10- 6	73- 3-10	34-19- 3

	4 Terms 1484-86	1486-87	1487-88	1488-89	1489-90	1490-91	1491-92	1493-94	1494-95	1495-96	1496-97	1497-98	Martinmas 1498-99
Royal Property	£337- 0- 4	£178-10- 2	£178-10- 2	£178-10- 2	£178-10- 2	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£274- 5- 3
Gross Charge for this Account	367- 9- 3	219- 4-10	178-10- 2	215-11-6	203-11- 6	195- 1- 6	18-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	280- 1- 0	202-16-10	182-16-10	347- 6- 0
Arrears	3- 5- 2	31-12- 3	195-14- 7	193- 5- 1	408-16- 7	352- 6- 2	497- 5- 4	257-12-1	211-17-11	91-11- 4	99- 5- 0	126-14- 4	-
Total Charge	370-14- 6	300-17- 1	374- 4- 9	408-16- 7	612- 8- 1	547- 7- 8	680- 2- 2	440- 8-11	394-14- 9	371-12- 4	302- 1-10	309-11- 2	347- 6- 0
Allowances for this Account	252- 4- 4	74-19- 8	124-19- 8	No Discharge	135-17- 8	40-12- 0	182- 1- 8	132- 3- 6	120- 3- 5	76-10- 2	138-13- 6	121-14- 2	43-17- 3
Total Allowances	252- 4- 4	74-19- 8	174-19- 8		237- 8- 0	40-12- 0	581- 1- 6	228-11- 0	177- 3- 5	76-10- 2	138-13- 6	139-14- 2	43-17- 3
Profit	118-10- 2	225-17- 5	199- 5- 1		375- 0- 1	506-15- 8	99- 0- 8	211-17-11	117-11- 4	195- 2- 2	163- 6- 4	169-17- 0	303- 8- 9
Real Revenue	36-17-11	30- 2-10	6- 0- 0		22-13- 4	9-10- 4	8- 9- 4	-	26- 0- 0	95-17- 2	36-12- 0	27-18- 0	70-19- 5
Balance	81-12- 3	195-14- 7	198- 5- 1		352- 6- 9	497- 5- 4	91-11- 4	211-17-11	91-11- 4	99- 5- 0	126-14- 4	141-19- 0	-
Value per Annum	115- 4-11	144- 5- 2	53-10- 6		67-13-10	154- 9- 6	0-15- 2	50-13- 4	62-13- 5	203-10-10	64- 3- 4	61- 2- 8	303- 8- 9

	Whitsun 1502	1502-03	1503-04	1504-05	1505-06	1506-07	1507-08	1508-09	1509-10	1511-12	1512-13
Royal Property	£ 91- 8- 5	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10
Gross charge for this Account	91- 8- 5	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	199-10- 2	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10
Arrears	29- 6- 4	33-16- 4	86-10- 8	173-18- 8	178-12- 8	343-12-10	218- 8- 0	36-19- 8	42- 3- 4	-	8- 0- 4
Total Charge	120-14- 9	216-13- 2	269- 7- 6	356-15- 6	378- 2-10	526- 9- 8	410- 4-10	219-16- 6	225- 0- 2	182-16-10	190-17- 2
Allowances for this Account	42-10- 5	111- 3- 8	95- 8-10	98- 8-10	6-12- 0	138- 3- 6	155-16- 6	171- 3- 2	160-17-10	166- 3- 2	175- 3 -10
Total Allowances	42-10- 5	130- 2- 6	95- 8-10	101-18-10	6-12- 0	298-13- 0	355- 1- 0	171- 3- 2	205- 3- 2	166- 3- 2	178-10- 6
Profit	78- 4- 4	86-10- 8	173-18- 8	254-16- 8	371-12-10	227-16- 8	46- 3- 0	48-13- 4	19-17- 0	16-13- 8	12- 6- 8
Real Revenue	44- 8- 0	-	-	76- 4- 0	27-18- 0	9- 8- 3	9- 3- 4	6-10- 0	8- 0- 0	8-13- 4	5-13- 8
Balance	33-16- 4	36-10- 8	173-18- 8	178-12- 8	343-14-10	218- 8- 0	36-19- 8	42- 3- 4	11-17- 0	8- 0- 4	5-13- 0
Value per Annum	48-18- 0	71-13- 2	87- 8- 0	84- 8- 0	192-18- 2	44-13- 4	27- 0- 4	11-13- 8	11-19- 0	16-13- 8	7-13- 0

	4 Terms 1484-86	1486-87	1487-88	1488-89	1489-90	1490-91	1491-92	1493-94	1494-95	1495-96	1496-97	1497-98	Martinmas 1498-99
Royal Property	£337- 0- 4	£178-10- 2	£178-10- 2	£178-10- 2	£178-10- 2	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£274- 5- 3
Gross Charge for this Account	367- 9- 3	219- 4-10	178-10- 2	215-11-6	203-11- 6	195- 1- 6	18-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	280- 1- 0	202-16-10	182-16-10	347- 6- 0
Arrears	3- 5- 2	31-12- 3	195-14- 7	193- 5- 1	408-16- 7	352- 6- 2	497- 5- 4	257-12-1	211-17-11	91-11- 4	99- 5- 0	126-14- 4	-
Total Charge	370-14- 6	300-17- 1	374- 4- 9	408-16- 7	612- 8- 1	547- 7- 8	680- 2- 2	440- 8-11	394-14- 9	371-12- 4	302- 1-10	309-11- 2	347- 6- 0
Allowances for this Account	252- 4- 4	74-19- 8	124-19- 8	No Discharge	135-17- 8	40-12- 0	182- 1- 8	132- 3- 6	120- 3- 5	76-10- 2	138-13- 6	121-14- 2	43-17- 3
Total Allowances	252- 4- 4	74-19- 8	174-19- 8		237- 8- 0	40-12- 0	581- 1- 6	228-11- 0	177- 3- 5	76-10- 2	138-13- 6	139-14- 2	43-17- 3
Profit	118-10- 2	225-17- 5	199- 5- 1		375- 0- 1	506-15- 8	99- 0- 8	211-17-11	117-11- 4	195- 2- 2	163- 6- 4	169-17- 0	303- 8- 9
Real Revenue	36-17-11	30- 2-10	6- 0- 0		22-13- 4	9-10- 4	8- 9- 4	-	26- 0- 0	95-17- 2	36-12- 0	27-18- 0	70-19- 5
Balance	81-12- 3	195-14- 7	198- 5- 1		352- 6- 9	497- 5- 4	91-11- 4	211-17-11	91-11- 4	99- 5- 0	126-14- 4	141-19- 0	-
Value per Annum	115- 4-11	144- 5- 2	53-10- 6		67-13-10	154- 9- 6	0-15- 2	50-13- 4	62-13- 5	203-10-10	64- 3- 4	61- 2- 8	303- 8- 9

	Whitsun 1502	1502-03	1503-04	1504-05	1505-06	1506-07	1507-08	1508-09	1509-10	1511-12	1512-13
Royal Property	£ 91- 8- 5	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10	£182-16-10
Gross charge for this Account	91- 8- 5	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	199-10- 2	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10	182-16-10
Arrears	29- 6- 4	33-16- 4	86-10- 8	173-18- 8	178-12- 8	343-12-10	218- 8- 0	36-19- 8	42- 3- 4	-	8- 0- 4
Total Charge	120-14- 9	216-13- 2	269- 7- 6	356-15- 6	378- 2-10	526- 9- 8	410- 4-10	219-16- 6	225- 0- 2	182-16-10	190-17- 2
Allowances for this Account	42-10- 5	111- 3- 8	95- 8-10	98- 8-10	6-12- 0	138- 3- 6	155-16- 6	171- 3- 2	160-17-10	166- 3- 2	175- 3 -10
Total Allowances	42-10- 5	130- 2- 6	95- 8-10	101-18-10	6-12- 0	298-13- 0	355- 1- 0	171- 3- 2	205- 3- 2	166- 3- 2	178-10- 6
Profit	78- 4- 4	86-10- 8	173-18- 8	254-16- 8	371-12-10	227-16- 8	46- 3- 0	48-13- 4	19-17- 0	16-13- 8	12- 6- 8
Real Revenue	44- 8- 0	-	-	76- 4- 0	27-18- 0	9- 8- 3	9- 3- 4	6-10- 0	8- 0- 0	8-13- 4	5-13- 8
Balance	33-16- 4	36-10- 8	173-18- 8	178-12- 8	343-14-10	218- 8- 0	36-19- 8	42- 3- 4	11-17- 0	8- 0- 4	5-13- 0
Value per Annum	48-18- 0	71-13- 2	87- 8- 0	84- 8- 0	192-18- 2	44-13- 4	27- 0- 4	11-13- 8	11-19- 0	16-13- 8	7-13- 0

.h) DETAILS OF ACCOUNTS OF EARLDOM OF MARCH

EARLDOM OF MARCH	1450-51	4 Terms 1452-53	1453-54	1454-55	1455-56	1456-57	1457-58	1458-59	1459-60	3 Terms 1461-62	1 Term 1462-62	3 Terms 1464-65
Royal Property £	542- 0- 8 £	354-12-10 £	532- 4-10 £	576- 4-10 £	576- 4-10 £	576- 4-10 £	550- 3- 2 £	350-13- 2 £	550-13- 2 £	835- 9- 9 £	276-13- 3 £	836- 0- 5
Gross Charge for this Account	821-13- 4	430-17- 4	563- 7- 2	608-7- 2	603- 7- 2	603- 7- 2	577-18-10	578- 8-10	607- 2- 2	935- 1- 1	301- 3- 7	922-19-11
Arrears	-	24-18- 8	48-10- 4	63- 3- 7	413-17- 2	- 0-10- 1	7- 6- 5	63-18- 5	82-19- 8	-	144- 9- 0	213-10-11
Total Charge	821-13-4	405-18- 8	611-17- 6	666-10- 9	1,017- 4- 4	602-17- 1	585- 5- 3	642- 7- 3	690- 1-10	935- 1- 1	445-12- 7	1,136-10-10
Allowances for this Account	144- 2- 7	265- 0- 4	233- 2- 9	250-16-11	363-18- 5	254- 1- 1	284-12- 2	364-10- 1	303- 3- 9	540-19- 5	226- 6- 4	426-12-10
Total Allowances	144- 2- 7	265-0- 4	260-15- 9	282- 3- 7	363-18- 5	259- 1- 1	291-18-10	241- 0-11	303- 3- 9	540-19- 5	226- 6- 4	493- 6- 2
Profit	677-10- 9	140-18- 4	351- 1- 9	384- 7- 2	653- 5-11	343-16- 0	293- 6- 5	221- 6- 4	386-18- 1	394- 1- 8	219- 6- 3	643- 4- 8
Real Revenue	-	92- 8- 0	45- 3- 4	32- 3- 4	34-10- 8	60-18- 7	112-15- 0	138- 6- 8	173- 7- 2	189-12- 8	18-17- 5	50- 0- 0
Balance	677-10- 9	48-10- 4	63-3 - 7	- 13- 6- 8	- 0-10- 1	7- 6- 5	63-18- 1	82-19- 3	213-10-11	104- 9- 8	6-10- 4	593- 4- 8
Value per Annum	677-10- 9	165-17- 0	330- 4- 5	352-10- 3	239- 8- 9	349- 6- 1	293- 6- 8	213-18- 9	303-18- 5	394- 1- 8	74-17- 3	496- 7- 1

EARLDOM GRANTED TO ALEXANDER, DUKE OF ALBANY

	1465-66	1466-67	6 Terms 1483-86	1486-7	1487-8	3 Terms 1488-9	1 Term 1489-90	1490-1	1491-2	1493-4	1494-5	1495-6
Royal Property £	543-19-10	543-19-10	£2,113-13- 6	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8	950-10- 4 £	348-16-10	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8 £	625- 3- 8 £	625- 3- 8
Gross Charge for this Account	641- 8- 6	719-14- 2	2,930- 0- 5	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	950-10- 4	421-16- 2	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	633-13- 7
Arrears	593- 4- 8	656-11- 6	-	1,518-12- 2	212-11- 8	-	577- 2- 4	63- 16-10	163- 1- 9	151-18-11	-	-
Total Charge	1,234-13- 2	1,376- 4- 8	2,930- 0- 5	2,153- 5- 9	846- 5- 3	950-10-4	998-18- 6	697-10- 5	796-15- 4	785-12- 6	633-13- 7	633-13- 7
Allowances for this Account	406- 3- 1	528-10- 3	771-18-11	466- 3-11	442-10- 0	326- 0- 0	322-19-11	472-15- 4	417-10- 0	307- 3-10	435- 3- 4	475- 3- 4
Total Allowances	433- 3- 1	625-19- 9	771-18-11	1,880-13- 9	442-10- 0	326- 0- 0	705- 5- 9	479- 2- 0	417-10- 0	486- 4- 2	455- 3- 4	475- 3- 4
Profit	801-10- 1	750- 4-11	2,158- 1- 6	271-12- 0	373-15- 3	624-10- 4	293-12- 9	218- 8- 5	379- 5- 4	94- 4- 0	178-10- 3	158-10- 3
Real Revenue	144-18- 7	120- 5- 7	639- 9- 4	390- 0- 4	85- 0- 0	47- 8- 0	229-15-11	55- 6- 8	174-16- 8	94- 4- 0	178-10- 7	158-10- 3
Balance	656-11- 6	351- 8- 4	1,518-12- 2	212-11- 8	288-15- 3	577- 2- 4	63-16-10	163- 1- 9	204- 8- 8	-	-	-
Value per Annum	325- 5- 5	191- 3-11	2,158- 1- 6	167- 9- 8	191- 3- 7	624-10- 4	98-16- 3	160-18- 3	216- 3- 7	326-11- 9	198-10- 3	158-10- 3

h) DETAILS OF ACCOUNTS OF EARLDOM OF MARCH

EARLDOM OF MARCH	1450-51	4 Terms 1452-53	1453-54	1454-55	1455-56	1456-57	1457-58	1458-59	1459-60	3 Terms 1461-62	1 Term 1462-62	3 Terms 1464-65
Royal Property	£ 542- 0- 8	£ 354-12-10	£ 532- 4-10	£ 576- 4-10	£ 576- 4-10	£ 576- 4-10	£ 550- 3- 2	£ 350-13- 2	£ 550-13- 2	£ 835- 9- 9	£ 276-13- 3	£ 836- 0- 5
Gross Charge for this Account	821-13- 4	430-17- 4	563- 7- 2	608-7- 2	603- 7- 2	603- 7- 2	577-18-10	578- 8-10	607- 2- 2	935- 1- 1	301- 3- 7	922-19-11
Arrears	-	24-18- 8	48-10- 4	63- 3- 7	413-17- 2	- 0-10- 1	7- 6- 5	63-18- 5	82-19- 8	-	144- 9- 0	213-10-11
Total Charge	821-13-4	405-18- 8	611-17- 6	666-10- 9	1,017- 4- 4	602-17- 1	585- 5- 3	642- 7- 3	690- 1-10	935- 1- 1	445-12- 7	1,136-10-10
Allowances for this Account	144- 2- 7	265- 0- 4	233- 2- 9	250-16-11	363-18- 5	254- 1- 1	284-12- 2	364-10- 1	303- 3- 9	540-19- 5	226- 6- 4	426-12-10
Total Allowances	144- 2- 7	265-0- 4	260-15- 9	282- 3- 7	363-18- 5	259- 1- 1	291-18-10	241- 0-11	303- 3- 9	540-19- 5	226- 6- 4	493- 6- 2
Profit	677-10- 9	140-18- 4	351- 1- 9	384- 7- 2	653- 5-11	343-16- 0	293- 6- 5	221- 6- 4	386-18- 1	394- 1- 8	219- 6- 3	643- 4- 8
Real Revenue	-	92- 8- 0	45- 3- 4	32- 3- 4	34-10- 8	60-18- 7	112-15- 0	138- 6- 8	173- 7- 2	189-12- 8	18-17- 5	50- 0- 0
Balance	677-10- 9	48-10- 4	63-3 - 7	- 13- 6- 8	- 0-10- 1	7- 6- 5	63-18- 1	82-19- 3	213-10-11	104- 9- 8	6-10- 4	593- 4- 8
Value per Annum	677-10- 9	165-17- 0	330- 4- 5	352-10- 3	239- 8- 9	349- 6- 1	293- 6- 8	213-18- 9	303-18- 5	394- 1- 8	74-17- 3	496- 7- 1

EARLDOM GRANTED TO ALEXANDER, DUKE OF ALBANY

	1465-66	1466-67	6 Terms 1483-86	1486-7	1487-8	3 Terms 1488-9	1 Term 1489-90	1490-1	1491-2	1493-4	1494-5	1495-6
Royal Property	£ 543-19-10	543-19-10	£2,113-13- 6	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8	950-10- 4 £	348-16-10	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8	625- 3- 8 £	625- 3- 8 £	625- 3- 8
Gross Charge for this Account	641- 8- 6	719-14- 2	2,930- 0- 5	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	950-10- 4	421-16- 2	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	633-13- 7
Arrears	593- 4- 8	656-11- 6	-	1,518-12- 2	212-11- 8	-	577- 2- 4	63- 16-10	163- 1- 9	151-18-11	-	-
Total Charge	1,234-13- 2	1,376- 4- 8	2,930- 0- 5	2,153- 5- 9	846- 5- 3	950-10-4	998-18- 6	697-10- 5	796-15- 4	785-12- 6	633-13- 7	633-13- 7
Allowances for this Account	406- 3- 1	528-10- 3	771-18-11	466- 3-11	442-10- 0	326- 0- 0	322-19-11	472-15- 4	417-10- 0	307- 3-10	435- 3- 4	475- 3- 4
Total Allowances	433- 3- 1	625-19- 9	771-18-11	1,880-13- 9	442-10- 0	326- 0- 0	705- 5- 9	479- 2- 0	417-10- 0	486- 4- 2	455- 3- 4	475- 3- 4
Profit	801-10- 1	750- 4-11	2,158- 1- 6	271-12- 0	373-15- 3	624-10- 4	293-12- 9	218- 8- 5	379- 5- 4	94- 4- 0	178-10- 3	158-10- 3
Real Revenue	144-18- 7	120- 5- 7	639- 9- 4	390- 0- 4	85- 0- 0	47- 8- 0	229-15-11	55- 6- 8	174-16- 8	94- 4- 0	178-10- 7	158-10- 3
Balance	656-11- 6	351- 8- 4	1,518-12- 2	212-11- 8	288-15- 3	577- 2- 4	63-16-10	163- 1- 9	204- 8- 8	-	-	-
Value per Annum	325- 5- 5	191- 3-11	2,158- 1- 6	167- 9- 8	191- 3- 7	624-10- 4	98-16- 3	160-18- 3	216- 3- 7	326-11- 9	198-10- 3	158-10- 3

EARLDOM GRANTED TO ALEXANDER, DUKE OF ALBANY

	1496-7	5 Terms 1497-99	1500-1	1501-2	1502-3	4 Terms 1503-5	1505-6	1506-7
Royal Property	£ 625- 3- 8	£1,584- 3-11	£ 625- 3- 8	£ 625- 3- 8	£ 573-11- 8	£1,164- 3- 2	£ 582- 1- 7	£ 582- 1- 7
Gross Charge for this Account	633-13- 7	1,604- 3-11	633-13- 7	633-13- 7	582- 1- 7	1,164- 3- 2	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7
Arrears	-	80- 3-11	324-12- 0	903-16- 5	1,405-1- 10	-	934- 3- 2	1,356- 4-11
Total Charge	633-13- 7	1,684- 7-10	958- 5- 7	1,537-10- 2	1,987- 3- 5	1,164- 3- 2	1,515- 4-11	1,938- 6- 6
Allowances for this Account	553- 9- 8	1,142- 7- 8	20- 0- 0	26- 8- 4	582- 5- 4	40- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	536-18-11
Total Allowances	553- 9- 8	1,205- 7- 8	20- 0- 0	42- 8- 4	1,765- 3- 5	40- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	1,893-13-10
Profit	80- 3-11	479- 0- 2	938- 5- 7	1,485- 1-10	122- 0- 0	1,124- 3- 2	1,496- 4-11	144-12- 8
Real Revenue	-	134- 0- 0	34- 9- 0	80- 0- 0	122- 0- 0	180- 0- 0	140- 0- 0	144-12- 8
Balance	80- 3-11	345- 0- 2	903-16- 7	1,405- 1-10	-	944- 3- 2	1,356- 4-11	-
Value per Annum	80- 3-11	461-16- 3	613-13- 7	607- 5- 3	- 0- 3- 9	1,124- 3- 2	562- 1- 7	45- 2- 8

	1507-8	1508-9	1509-10	1511-12	1512-3
Royal Property	£582- 1- 7	£ 582- 1- 7	£ 582- 1- 7	£ 582- 1- 7	£ 582- 1- 7
Gross Charge for this Account	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7
Arrears	-	6- 0- 0	128- 1- 7	-	-
Total Charge	582- 1- 7	588- 1- 7	710- 3- 2	582- 1- 7	582- 1- 7
Allowances for this Account	440- 0- 0	420- 1- 7	426- 0- 0	417- 0- 0	453- 0- 0
Total Allowances	440- 0- 0	420- 1- 7	438- 0- 0	417- 0- 0	459- 0- 0
Profit	142- 1- 7	168- 1- 7	272- 3- 2	165- 1- 7	133- 1- 7
Real Revenue	136- 1- 7	40- 0- 0	166-13- 4	165- 1- 7	133- 1- 7
Balance	6- 0- 0	128- 1- 7	105- 9-10	-	-
Value per Annum	142- 1- 7	168- 1- 7	156- 1- 7	165- 1- 7	139- 1- 7

APPENDIX B/2 (i)

DETAILS OF ACCOUNTS OF LORDSHIP OF GALLOWAY

	3 Terms 1455-6	1456-7	1457-8	1458-9	1459-60	1 Term 1460-60	3 Terms 1460-2	14 Terms 1462-9	1470-1	1472-3	1473-4	1474-5
Crown Property	£ 639- 6- 4	£ 468- 2- 0	£ 472- 2- 0	£ 472- 2- 0	£ 472- 2- 0	£ 236- 1- 1	£ 658-17- 2	£3,117- 1- 5	£ 445- 5-11	£ 450- 2- 7	£ 450- 2- 7	£ 450- 2- 7
Total charge for this Account	1,563- 7- 0	506-10- 2	613- 8- 8	567-13- 0	623- 0- 8	330- 1- 1	830- 7- 2	3,471-13- 6	680-18- 7	450- 2- 7	450- 2- 7	450- 2- 7
Arrears	-	- 135-13- 4	-	24- 3- 8	88- 9- 4	171- 0-10	101- 9- 5	190- 8-11	837-13- 5	888- 1- 6	623-16- 8	686-19-10
Total Charge	1,563- 7- 0	370-16-10	613- 8- 8	591-16- 8	711-10- 0	501- 1-11	931-16- 7	3,662- 2- 5	1,518-12- 0	1,338- 4- 1	1,073-19- 4	1,137- 2- 5
Allowances for this Account	897-14- 4	318-11-11	183- 4-10	242- 6- 8	200-19- 8	143-12- 8	18- 2- 0	359-13- 4	119-18- 8	221-17- 4	95-18- 4	99- 3- 4
Total Allowances	897-14- 4	358-11-11	195- 5-10	242- 6- 8	200-19- 8	158- 9- 4	18- 2- 0	359-13- 4	163- 5- 4	276-17- 4	95-18- 4	104- 3- 4
Profit	665-12- 8	17- 4-11	418- 3-10	347- 0- 0	510-10- 4	328-12- 7	913-14- 7	3,302- 9- 1	1,355- 6- 8	1,060-16- 9	978-10-10	1,032-19- 1
Real Revenue	669- 6- 0	5- 4-11	394- 0- 2	258-10- 8	339- 9- 6	227- 3- 2	668-15- 8	2,350- 8- 4	447- 3-10	423-13- 4	276- 4- 6	395- 6- 8
Balance	- 123-13- 4	-	24- 3- 8	88- 9- 4	171- 0-10	101- 9- 5	190- 8-11	952- 0- 9	-	623-16- 9	686-19-10	637-12- 5
Value per Annum	665-12- 8	187-18- 2	440- 3-10	325- 6- 4	422- 1- 0	172- 8- 5	812- 5- 2	3,112- 0- 2	908- 2-10	228- 5- 3	354- 4- 3	350-19- 3

	1475-6	1476-7	1477-8	1478-9	1479-80	1480-1	1481-2	1483-4	1484-5	1485-6	1486-7	1487-8
Crown Property	£ 488- 2- 8	£ 490-12- 8	£ 511-19- 4	£ 501- 6- 0	£ 497- 6- 0	£ 497- 6- 0	£ 497- 6- 0	£ 520-12- 8	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	520-12- 8	520-12- 8
Total charge for this Account	881-16- 0	490-12- 8	851- 6- 0	501- 6- 0	516- 2- 8	497-6- 0	497- 6- 0	520-12- 8	656-19- 4	973- 9- 4	520-12- 8	520-12- 8
Arrears	637-12- 5	62-11- 5	91-15- 9	91-13- 6	100-13- 5	124-15- 1	193-13- 5	615- 3-10	629-16- 6	700- 4- 5	236- 4- 6	220-19- 6
Total charge	1,519- 8- 5	553- 4- 1	943- 1- 9	592-19-11	616-16- 1	622- 1- 1	690-19- 5	1,135-16- 6	1,286-15- 4	1,673-13- 9	756-17- 2	741-12- 2
Allowances for this Account	80- 9- 0	123- 6- 6	77-11- 3	65- 6- 8	31- 0- 0	4-13- 5	4-13- 4	26- 0- 0	48-15- 0	750- 1- 8	83- 2- 4	76-10- 4
Total Allowances	80- 9- 0	133- 6- 6	79-17-11	68-16- 9	58-16- 8	4-13- 5	4-13- 4	26- 0- 0	48-15- 0	838- 3- 4	110-12- 4	90-17- 0
Profit	1,438-19- 5	429-17- 7	863- 3-10	524- 3- 3	557-19- 5	617- 7- 8	686- 6- 1	1,109-16- 6	1,238- 0- 4	835-10- 5	646- 4-10	650-15- 2
Real Revenue	752-11- 3	338- 1-10	754- 0- 4	423- 9-10	483-14- 4	423-14- 3	349-10- 0	480- 0- 0	537-15-11	567- 9- 4	425- 4- 4	381- 8- 0
Balance	686- 8- 2	91-15- 9	91-13- 6	100-13- 5	124-15- 1	193-13- 5	336-16- 1	629-16- 6	700- 4- 5	268- 1- 1	220-19- 6	269- 7- 2
Value per Annum	801- 7- 0	367- 6- 2	773-14- 9	435-19- 4	485- 2- 8	492-12- 7	492-12- 8	494-12- 8	608- 4- 4	223- 7- 8	437-10- 4	444- 2- 4

	1487-8	1488-9	1489-90	1490-1	3 Terms 1493-4	1 Term 1494-5	1495-6	1 Term 1496-7	3 Terms 1497-8	1 Term 1498-9	3 Terms 1499-1501	1501-2
Crown Property	£ 520-12- 8	£ 520-19- 4	£ 521-12- 8	£ 521-12- 8	£ 782- 9- 0	£ 260-16- 4	£ 521-11- 8	£ 260-15-10	£ 782- 7- 6	£ 782- 9- 0	£ 798- 0- 0	£ 532- 0- 0
Total Charge for this Account	520-12- 8	737-11- 0	531-12- 8	521-12- 8	800-19- 0	26-16- 4	521-11- 8	260-15-10	1463-10- 2	782- 9- 0	928-16- 8	575- 6- 8
Arrears	220-19- 6	269- 7- 2	375-19- 6	679- 5-10	1,618- 9-10	1,710- 8- 6	1,626-14- 2	1,289- 4- 8	-	-	-	133- 6- 7
Total Charge	741-12- 2	1,006-18- 2	907-12- 2	1,200-18- 6	2,419- 8-10	1,971- 4-10	2,148- 5-10	1,550- 0- 6	1,463-10- 2	782- 9- 0	928-16- 8	708-13- 3
Allowances for this Account	76-10- 4	100- 1- 8	63-11- 8	53-16- 8	20- 0- 0	19- 8- 8	181- 6- 4	32-10- 0	45-15-10	126-15-10	253- 9- 5	201-19-10
Total Allowances	90-17- 0	100- 1- 8	68-11- 8	53-16- 8	20- 0- 0	19- 8- 8	547- 7-10	52-10- 0	45-15-10	126-15-10	253- 9- 5	249-16- 6
Profit	650-15- 2	906-16- 6	839- 0- 6	1,370-10-10	2,399- 8-10	1,951-16- 2	1,600-18- 0	1,487-10- 6	1,417-15- 2	655-13- 2	675- 7- 3	458-16- 9
Real Revenue	381- 8- 0	530-17- 0	403-13- 8	691- 5- 0	689- 0- 4	325- 2- 0	321-13- 4	120- 0- 0	921- 7- 8	581- 5- 9	542- 0- 8	357- 6- 9
Balance	269- 7- 2	375-19- 6	435- 6-10	679- 5-10	1,710- 8- 6	1,626-14- 2	1,289- 4- 8	1,377-10- 6	496- 7- 6	74- 7- 5	133- 6- 7	101-10- 0
Value per Annum	444-2 -4	637- 9- 4	468- 1- 0	923- 4- 0	780-19- 0	241- 7- 8	340- 5- 4	228- 5-10	1,417-15- 2	655-13- 2	675- 7- 3	373- 6-10

	1 Term 1502-3	3 Terms 1503-4	1504-5	1505-6	1506-7
Crown Property	£ 266- 0- 0	£1,060- 0- 0	£1,036-17- 8	£1,036-17- 8	£1,036-17- 8
Total Charge for this Account	316- 0- 0	1,250- 8- 4	1,036-17- 8	1,036-17- 8	1,094-15- 4
Arrears	101-10- 0	101-10- 0	340-14- 1	495-18- 0	619-12- 8
Total Charge	417-10- 2	1,566- 8- 4	1,377-11-10	1,532-15- 8	1,713- 8- 0
Allowances for this Account		509-16- 7	93- 7- 0	110- 6- 8	104-18- 8
Total Allowances		509-16- 7	93- 7- 0	140- 6- 8	121- 8- 8
Profit		1,056-11- 9	1,284- 4-10	1,392- 9- 0	1,591-19- 4
Real Revenue		682- 0- 2	789- 3- 2	770-16- 4	675-11- 8
Balance		340-14- 1	495- 1- 8	611-12- 8	916- 7- 8
Value per Annum		740-11-9	943-10- 8	926-11- 0	989-16- 8

NO DISCHARGE

	1507-8	1508-9	1509-10	1512-13
Crown Property	£1,036-17- 8	£1,036-17- 8	£1,036-17- 8	£1,036-17- 8
Total charge for this Account	1,049-17- 8	1,066-17- 8	1,063-11- 0	1,046-17- 8
Arrears	916- 8- 8	1,088-2- 8	1,496- 9- 0	90- 6- 7
Total Charge	1,966- 6- 4	2,125- 0- 4	2,560- 0- 0	1,137- 4- 3
Allowances for this Account	116- 5- 4	143- 5- 4	150-10- 0	270- 7- 0
Total Allowances	116- 5- 4	159- 5- 4	250-10- 0	270- 7- 0
Profit	1,850- 1- 0	1,965-15- 0	2,309-10- 0	866-17- 3
Real Revenue	761-18- 4	469- 6- 0	885-10- 4	735-18- 4
Balance	1,088- 2- 9	1,496- 9- 0	1,423-19- 8	117-12- 3
Value per Annum	933-12- 4	923-12- 4	913- 1- 0	776-10- 8

'APPENDIX B/2 (j) THE EXTENT OF THE ROYAL DEMESNE, 1450-4, 1508-13

(ER, Vols. V, Xiii)

1450-4

PROPERTY	First Recorded Account		Gross Annual Value 1450s	1510s
		CASTLE PROPERTY		
Ballincrief, Gosford	1456	Castle property associated with Edinburgh Castle	£ 88	£ 65
Lordship of Stirlingshire	1453	" " " " Stirling Castle	£143	£313
Constabulary of Linlithgowshire	1450	" " " " Linlithgow Palace (Incl. Wra & Houston)	£ 84	£183
		STEWART PROPERTY INHERITED BY JAMES I		
Earldom of Carrick	1433	22 June 1368 David II granted the earldom to John Stewart, (later Robert III)	£ 46	£ 69
Bute & Arran	1436	Between 1314 and 1325 Bute was granted to Robert the Steward. In 1366 the entire lands of the Steward (viz. Bute, Cowal, Knapdale, Arrand and the Cumbraes were valued at £1,000 old extent.	£142	£142
		1387 Property in Arran was surrendered to the crown by Janet Erskine in return for an annual pension of £100 from the burgh farms and fishing of Aberdeen	£ 57	£ -
Cowal	1443		£ 31	£ 31
Cumbrae (Great & Small)	1454	(Stewart land connected with the castle of Dumbarton.	£ 33	£ 33
Cardross	1454	(	£ 27	£ 27
Annual rent from Cadzow	1454	(	£ 27	£ 27
Rosneath	1454	(	£ 37	£ 40
		By the reign of James IV the farms of Rosneath were included in the accounts of Chamberlain of Cowal		
		The other estates connected with the Stewart inheritance did not contain any property and the Stewarts only retained the rights of superiority - viz. Kilbride, Cunningham, Kyle Regis.		
		(By 1501, in place of the profit from Rosneath Dumbarton castle received annually 5 chalders of meal from the monestary of Paisley and 3 chalders of barley, 10 marts from Cumbrae)		

PROPERTY	First Recorded Account	PROPERTY WHICH FELL TO THE CROWN THROUGH THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF ALBANY IN 1425	Gross Annual Value 1450s	1510s
Earldom of Lennox	1433	Following the execution of earl Duncan in 1425, his property was declared to be in non-entry, despite the existance of his daughter Isabell and despite the shortage of accounts, the profits from the earldom seem to have benefitted the crown for at least the next 40 years (Single account of 1458-9)	£197	£ -
Earldom of Fife	1450	Obtained by Robert, duke of Albany through his marriage to Isabell, countess of Fife in 1371 and in the indenture Robert was accepted as her heir. Forfeited 1425.	£560	£966
Earldom of Menteith	1433	Obtained by Robert, duke of Albany in 1361 through his marriage to Margaret, countess of Menteith. Forfeited 1425 (Parts of the old earldom were distributed to Malise Graham the former earl of Strathearn and Edmonstone of Culloden) (included farm of Strathgartney)	£332	£798
Strathurd	1450	1389 Resigned by Isabell, countess of Fife to Robert II reconveyed the property to Robert, duke of Albany Forfeited 1425	£ 83	£ -
Strathbran	1450		£ 46	£ -
Dischier and Toyer	1450		£ 92	£ 96
Oneil	1450		See Coull	
Fortingall	1450	Gifted to Robert, duke of Albany by Robert III Foreited 1425.	£ 16	18
		PROPERTY WHICH FELL TO THE CROWN FOLLOWING THE FORFEITURE OF WALTER, EARL OF ATHOLL IN 1437		
Earldom of Ahtoll	One Account of 1449-50	Retained by the crown until C 1457 when it was granted to John Stewart of Balvanie	£123	£ -
Methven	1450	Granted to Walter Stewart, son of Robert II by his father	£120	£107
Glenlion	1450		£ 33	£ 61
Rannach	1450		£ 18	£ 30
Forest of Cluny	1450		£ 13	£ 13
Earldom of Strathearn	1442	James I deprived the earl, Malise Graham of his earldom and in 1427 conveyed it in liferent to the earl of Atholl	£462	£880
Brechin and Nevar	1450	Acquired by earl Walter through his marriage to Margaret Barclay, the sole heiress to the lands of Brechin. However, granted to Sir Christian Stewart in 1511.	£115	£267

Property	First Recorded Account	OTHER ESTATES ACQUIRED BETWEEN 1424-1454	Gross Annual Value 1450s	1510s
Earldom of March	1450	1400 Forfeited by George Dunbar, earl of March and although he was rehabilitated by the Regent Albany in 1409, in 1434 James I revoked the 1409 settlement as Albany had overreached his authority as regent and March was again deprived of his property.	£576	£582
		DUNBAR in separate Account	£ -	£367
Annandale	1448	1400 Forfeited by earl of March but, in 1409 the lands were granted by Albany to Archibald, earl of Douglas and his heirs male. In 1440 the heirs male of the original Douglas line died out following the murder of earl William and his brother David and Annandale lapsed to the crown.	£ 30	£ 30
Earldom of Mar	1436	In 1436 the earldom was annexed to the crown following the death of Alexander Stewart earl of Mar without heirs, and the claims of lord Erskine were ignored. (The 1510s Account included only Strathdee and Croomar and Abergeldy)	£427	£231
Tillicoultry	1453	Granted by Regent Albany to his son John, earl of Buchan on the occasion of his marriage.	£ 41	£ 56
Coull	1451	Granted to John by Robert III Both Tillicoultry and Coull fell to the crown on the death of Elizabeth, countess of Buchan sometime before 1451.	£ 30 (Coull and Oneil)	£ 30
Strathgartney	1450	Not part of the old earldom of Menteith although included in the accounts of the chamberlain of Menteith.	For Farm see Menteith	£72

OVERALL MOVEMENT OF ROYAL INCOME FROM ROYAL DEMESNE

	Gross Charge	Gross Farm from Property	Real Revenue	Real Revenue Percentage of gross charge
JAMES II 1456-60	£6,661	£5,430	£2,518	38
JAMES III 1484-88	£8,350	£7,248	£3,516	42
JAMES IV 1508-13	£11,293	£10,475	£6,625	58

PROPERTY	First Recorded Account		Gross Annual Value	
		Acquired by David II from Sir Robert Erskine in exchange for Alloa.		
Kinclaven	1450	1383 granted by Robert II to John Stewart, his illegitimate son by Mary Cardney and reverted to the crown on his death.	£ 72	£ 72
Property within the Barony of Houston and Wra	1456	Acquired in marriage by sir George Crichton of Carnis and acquired by James II through an exchange.	£ 57	See Linlith-gowshire
3 Thanages of Fettercairn, Kincardine, Arbuthnot	1458	Lands among the estates granted to the nun countess of Ross in 1415 by the Regent Albany but the transaction was repudiated by James I and when John, lord of the Isles was gifted the earldom of Ross, part of the 3 thanages was retained by the crown.	£ 71	£ 77
Abthania of Dull	1450	There is little surviving evidence concerning the history of this property, but it was probably part of the estate of Walter, earl of Atholl.	£ 52	£108
		DOUGLAS PROPERTY FORFEITED IN 1455		
Ettrick Forest	1456	Granted to sir James Douglas by Robert I	£1,122	
Galloway	1456	The area between the river Nith and Cree was granted to Archibald Douglas by David II while the other part (the former earldom of Wigtown) was soon after given to Archibald by sir Malcolm Flemming.	£1,037	(Incl. Kirk-Andrews)
Stewarton		James Douglas of Balvanie obtained the property on 12 Jan 1426-7 from James I following the death of John, earl of Buchan. The estate was transferred to the main Douglas line when James became 7th earl of Douglas.	£149	
Moray (in shires of Elgin and Forres)	1456	1372 these lands were granted by Robert II to John Dunbar. Of the 2 heiresses of earl James, the elder, Janet, was ignored and all the inheritance passed to the other Elizabeth who had married Archibald Douglas created earl of Moray, in 1442	£282	
Leffaris and other property in the shire of Inverness	1456		£ 54	
Glencairny	1456		£110	
Thanage of Kintore			£ 45	
Ardmeanach	1456	Formerly the property of the Morays of Bothwell, 1362, through the marriage of Archibald, lord of Galloway (later earl of Douglas) and Jean Moray, the property passed to the Douglasses and later bestowed on Hugh Douglas, earl of Ormond	£193	

Property	First Recorded Account		Gross Annual Value 1508-13
Petty and Brackly	1456	Formerly the possession of the Morays of Bothwell and later conveyed to John Douglas of Balvanie.	£ 80
Strathdearn	1456		£ 47
1/3 Duffus	1456	In the possession of the earl of Ormond	Incl. in Moray
Bonnoch and Bonnochare	1456	Royal Property Recorded in the Accounts 1508-1512, which was not in the Crown's Hands in 1450-4.	£ 30
		Acquired following the two forfeitures of John, Lord of the Isles and Earl of Ross 1475 and 1493.	
Earldom of Ross	1476	Acquired by the lord of the Isles through his marriage to the heiress of Alexander Leslie, earl of Ross.	£289
Urquhart and Glenmoriston	1476	Although forfeited by the Douglasses in 1455 and recorded as part of the annexed estates, it was immediately granted in liferent to the earl of Ross until 1475.	£100
Lordship of the Isles	1507 (only Account)	Although the property included in the Lordship fell to the crown in 1493, there is only one recorded account for 1507 which included only the charge side.	£212 (only a charge side recorded)
Grenane	1508	Following the forfeiture of the Lord of the Isles, theproperty was granted in liferent to his wife, Elizabeth, countess of Ross who died around 1507-8 and the property lapsed to the crown.	£ 20
Kintyre	1502	Part of the estate forfeited by John, Lord of the Isles in 1493.	£386
Arran		Crown (see above), in 1503 granted to James, lord Hamilton	
Kilmarnock Dalry Kilbride Noddisdale	1487 In 1504	1470 granted to Queen Margaret for life and reverted to the crown on her death. the lordship was granted in liferent to Queen Margaret Tudor.	£367
		PROPERTY FORFEITED BY THE BOYDS 1469	
Drumcoll	1501	Crown	£ 67
Stewarton		Crown (See above)	
Terremzeane	1501	Crown	£120
Turnberry		Crown (Part of the Earldom of Carrick)	
Meklecumbrae		Crown (Part of the porperty associated with Dumbarton Castle)	
Risedalemuir		See Kilmarnock	
Caverton		Granted in liferent to Mary, lady Hamilton in 1482.	
Teling & Polgavy	1470	Crown,but in 1497 the lands were granted to Sir John Ramsey for life.	£ 58

Property which formed part of the royal demesne in the period 1450-4 but which had ceased to appear in the royal accounts during the latter years of James IV's reign.

Arran	In 1503 James IV granted the lands and title of the earldom of Arran to James, lord Hamilton. (Earlier in 1467 Thomas Boyd had received the same concession from the young James III as part of his dowry following his marriage to the king's sister, only to loose the grant in 1469)
Earldom of Lennox	James III granted the earldom in liferent to Andrew, lord Avdondale and on his death the property was divided amongst John, lord Darnely, (who also received the title of earl).
Strathbran	1506 the lands of Strathbran, Achinvaid, Catlelaw and Glenshee was granted in mortmain to the King's chapel at Stirling Castle.
Strathurd	In 1454 when sir George Crichton resigned the newly acquired earldom of Caithness to James II his son James was besieged at Blackness castle, the lands of Strathurd were bestowed on James Crichton as compensation.
Earldom of Atholl	In 1457 it was granted to John Stewart, brother of James II.
Forest of Cluny	Although the forest famrs were still charged in royal accounts, in 1505 the forest was granted officially to Andrew Stewart, son of John, earl of Atholl.
Balvanie, Bocharm etc.	In 1460 the property was granted to John Stewart, brother of James II.
Mugwell and Stoneywood	In 1455 these estated were granted to Thomas Fraser, in exchange for the lands of Cornton in Stirlingshire.
Bothwell	Following the forfeiture of the Douglas family in 1455 the lordship passed to Euphemia Graham, widow of 5th earl of Douglas and wife of James, lord Hamilton. Receipts to the crown from the estated are recorded for the year ending 1471 in the account of the shefiff of Lanark and from Martinmas 1473 to 1481 under a royal chamberlain. During the 1480s the lordship was in the hands of the king's 'favourite' John Ramsey until his forfeiture in 1488 when the property passed to Patrick Hepburn, earl of Bothwell (However between 1492 and 1498 the estate was temporarily in the hands of Archibald, earl of Angus).

Property	First Recorded Account	OTHER ESTATES	Gross Annual Value
Orkney and Shetland	1472	Mortgaged by the king of Denmark for part of the marriage dowry of Queen Margaret in 1469 but since the king of Denmark was unable to repay the outstanding sum, the property was never returned by the Scottish king.	£433
Cornton	1455	1455 James II affected an exchange of property with Thomas Fraser through which Fraser acquired the land of Muchal and Stoneywood in Aberdeenshire and the king gained Cornton.	Schalders of wheat
Leswalt, Menybrig	1464	On the death of George Douglas of Leswalt without heirs, his property lapsed to the crown.	£111
		Both estates feel to the crown after the death of Mary of Guelders in 1463.	
Kirkandrews	1464	Granted to Mary of Guelders in 1459 on the resignation of John Shaw.	See Galloway
Garioch	1464	1452 Granted to Mary of Guelders following the death of Countess of Buchan who received the estated from James I.	£151
¼ Beufort	1500	Acquired by the crown through an exchange with Janet Fenton for the mains and mill of Kinclaven.	£ 10

Property	First Recorded Account	OTHER ESTATES	Gross Annual Value
Orkney and Shetland	1472	Mortgaged by the king of Denmark for part of the marriage dowry of Queen Margaret in 1469 but since the king of Denmark was unable to repay the outstanding sum, the property was never returned by the Scottish king.	£433
Cornton	1455	1455 James II affected an exchange of property with Thomas Fraser through which Fraser acquired the land of Muchal and Stoneywood in Aberdeenshire and the king gained Cornton.	Schalders of wheat
Leswalt, Menybrig	1464	On the death of George Douglas of Leswalt without heirs, his property lapsed to the crown.	£111
		Both estates feel to the crown after the death of Mary of Guelders in 1463.	
Kirkandrews	1464	Granted to Mary of Guelders in 1459 on the resignation of John Shaw.	See Galloway
Garioch	1464	1452 Granted to Mary of Guelders following the death of Countess of Buchan who received the estated from James I.	£151
¼ Beufort	1500	Acquired by the crown through an exchange with Janet Fenton for the mains and mill of Kinclaven.	£ 10

APPENDIX B/3 (a) RISE OF SEVERAL LAIRD FAMILIES through Investment in Crown Leases (ER, ix, 561-7, xii, 631-5)

1480 Edmonstone of Duntreath in Earldom of Menteith				1480 William Edmonstone of Druntreath			1502 Archibald Edmonstone of Duntreath	
Arkanknokenes	£ 2-13- 4	2B Barley	2 Mutton	Grassum	£ 2-13- 4			
½ Ardmacmonan	1-13-4	1½B "	1½ "	"	1-13- 4	Ibid		
Grodich	1- 6- 8	1B "	1 "	"	1- 6- 8			
Ward of Gudy	2- 0- 0			"	2- 0- 0	Ibid		
✠ Broklen	6-13- 4			"	5- 0- 0			
Ballemorik	2-10- 0			"	2-10- 0	Ibid		
Bra of Cammis	5- 0 -0			"	5- 0- 0	Ibid		
Callyebuchquhailye	2- 0- 0				-	Ibid		
Kers of Cammis						Ibid		
Drumcampsy		£10	Custody of			Ibid		
Le Frew		£10	Doune			Ibid		
Balkenoch		£ 3-6-8	Castle			Ibid		
Brewhouse of Doune	0- 6- 8							
Mill of Doune	In his hands		3C 8B Oatmeal			Ibid		
Fishery of Doune	" " "		260 Salmon			Ibid		
Buchquhopill							Grassum	£13- 6- 8
Cammisedward and Mill				£ 5- 0- 0	1C Oatmeal			5- 0- 0
Gartincabir				4- 0- 0				4- 0- 0
Mill of Kippane					8B Oatmeal			
✠ Birkland				6-13- 4				6-13- 4
Newtoun of Doune				2-13- 4	5C Oats			2-13- 4
Correquhormey				1-10- 0	1B Barley, 1 Sheep			1-10- 0
C				3- 6- 8	2B " 2 "			3- 6- 8
Blaregarry				2- 0- 0	2B " 2 "			2- 0- 0
Eddralekualch				2- 0- 0	2B " 2 "			3-13- 4
1MK Branquhalze				0- 6- 8				
Annual Rent 1480	£24- 3- 4 + Castle Lands 4½B Barley, 4½ Sheep			£54- 0- 0	5C Oats, 9B Oatmeal, 8½B Barley, 8½ Sheep + Castle Lands			

RISE OF SEVERAL LAIRDS IN GALLOWAY. 1503 9 yrs. Lease (ER, xii, 650-7)

Edward Maxwell of Tynwald

Mekle and Lityll Almones	£12- 0- 0
Muncheis, Castelgour, Barascherne, Marinauche, Mill of Buthill, Town of Buthill	6-13- 4
Brekehauch	6-13- 4
Chapeltone	4- 6- 8
Cragtoune	3- 6- 8
Logane	6-13- 4
Annual Rent	£53- 6- 8

McLellan, Laird of Bomby

¼ Nethir and Uvir Keldun and Island	£ 6-13- 4
Uvir, Midill and Nethir Louchdoganis	30- 0- 0
Le Markis	5- 6- 8
Markland of Kilbride	2- 0- 0
Largway	3- 6- 8
Corscrage, Carsumly, Blairley Caldew	30- 0- 0
Cubbois	6- 0- 0
Grange of Sannak	40- 0- 0
Culcragiis and Meithfeld	12- 0- 0
Castellmanel of Kirkcudbright	2- 0- 0
Mill of Culvene	5- 6- 8
Annual Rent	£142-13- 4

Carnis of Orchartoun

Balgredane	£14- 0- 0
Guffoklande	4-13- 4
Knokmeikill	8- 0- 0
Knoklitill	6- 0- 0
Culgnaw	1- 6- 8
Fishery of Ur	0-13- 4
Annual Rent	£34-13- 4

Lindsay of Faregarth

Corbortone	£15- 0- 0
Carlinwerk	3- 6- 8
Mill of Suthvik	3- 0- 0
Uvir, Midill and Nethir Ardees	20- 0- 0
	£41- 6- 8

Murray of Cokpule

Redebank	£ 2- 0- 0
Mylnebank	2-13- 4
½ Cresok	2-13- 4
Mekill and Lith Clouthok	6-13- 4
Clonyark	1- 6- 8
Drumstinschell	4- 0- 0
½ Nethir Sannak	6-13- 4
Annual Rent	£26- 0- 0

Dunbar of Mochrum

½ Drumboy	£ 2-13- 4
½ Ernelock	2- 0- 0
Bernetagart	5- 6- 8
Egernes, Culdery, Ardecupe	20- 0- 0
Knokaffrik	5- 0- 0
Grange of Baldone	40- 0- 0
	£75- 0- 0

McDowele of Gartlane		McCulloch of Myreton	
Clutauch	£ 4-13- 4	Knokkincur	£ 6-13- 4
½ Tullylaigruch	6- 0- 0	Alidne	3- 6- 8
Leffynolld, Lauchtalpane, Kermultyburgh, Lauchbeg	30- 0- 0	Kerewalkok	5- 0- 0
		Caludnes	1-13- 4
		Quiltis	3- 0- 0
		Largis	4- 0- 0
		Balgregane	4- 0- 0
Annual Rent	£40-13- 4		£27-13- 4

APPENDIX B/3 (b) The Lease and Feu of Property within the Earldom of Strathearn. (ER, Appendix to Vols lx to Xlll)

GLENLICHERN

Lessees

		@ 25/-	@ 50/-	@ 25/-	Rent	Grassum
1480	3yr.L	John Shaw of Knockhill	Andrew Drummond	Margaret and son John Murray	£ 5	£ 5
1486	"	"	"	" " "	£ 5	£ 5
1488	"	"	"	" " "	£ 5	£ 5
1490	"	"	"	" " "	£ 5	£ 5
1492	"	"	?	" " "	50/-	50/-
1499	"		John, lord Drummond		£ 5	£ 5
1502	9 yr. L		Margaret, daughter of LordDrummond		£10	£10
1505	3 yr. L		John, lord Drummond		£ 5	£ 5
1509	F		"		£10	NIL

CARGARTHLAND AND QUILTBALLACH

1480	3 yr. L	John Murray		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1486	"	"		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1488	"	David Drummond		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1490	"	John, lord Drummond		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1492	"	"		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1499	"	"		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1502	9yr. L	John Drummond @ £4	William Drummond @ £7	£11	£11
1505	5yr. L	Agnes Drummond @ £4			
1509	F	Agnes Drummond @ £5	James Drummond @ £8-15/-	£13-15/-	£13-15/-

McDowele of Gartlane		McCulloch of Myreton	
Clutauch	£ 4-13- 4	Knokkincur	£ 6-13- 4
½ Tullylaigruch	6- 0- 0	Alidne	3- 6- 8
Leffynolld, Lauchtalpane, Kermultyburgh, Lauchbeg	30- 0- 0	Kerewalkok	5- 0- 0
		Caludnes	1-13- 4
		Quiltis	3- 0- 0
		Largis	4- 0- 0
		Balgregane	4- 0- 0
Annual Rent	£40-13- 4		£27-13- 4

APPENDIX B/3 (b) The Lease and Feu of Property within the Earldom of Strathearn. (ER, Appendix to Vols 1x to X111)

GLENLICHERN

Lessees

		@ 25/-	@ 50/-	@ 25/-	Rent	Grassum
1480	3yr.L	John Shaw of Knockhill	Andrew Drummond	Margaret and son John Murray	£ 5	£ 5
1486	"	"	"	" " "	£ 5	£ 5
1488	"	"	"	" " "	£ 5	£ 5
1490	"	"	"	" " "	£ 5	£ 5
1492	"	"	?	" " "	50/-	50/-
1499	"		John, lord Drummond		£ 5	£ 5
1502	9 yr. L		Margaret, daughter of LordDrummond		£10	£10
1505	3 yr. L		John, lord Drummond		£ 5	£ 5
1509	F		"		£10	NIL

CARGARTHLAND AND QUILTBALLACH

1480	3 yr. L	John Murray		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1486	"	"		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1488	"	David Drummond		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1490	"	John, lord Drummond		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1492	"	"		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1499	"	"		£ 5-10/-	£ 5-10/-
1502	9yr. L	John Drummond @ £4	William Drummond @ £7	£11	£11
1505	5yr. L	Agnes Drummond @ £4			
1509	F	Agnes Drummond @ £5	James Drummond @ £8-15/-	£13-15/-	£13-15/-

LEASE OF LANDS OF FERNES AND DASKY WITHIN THE EARLDOM OF STRATHEARN

Lease for 3 years

1480	½ William Mason and son William @ £3 Grassum £3	½ John Philipson and son John @ £3 Grassum £3
1486	Ibid	Ibid
1488	½ John, lord Drummond and son William @ £3 Grassum £3 (He promised to remose William Mason from the position which he occupied)	Ibid

	DASKY		FERNES	
1490	James Redheuch @ £2 Grassum £2	½	John Philipson and son John @ £2 Grassum £2	William Mason and Son William @ £2 Grassum £2
1492	Ibid		Ibid	Ibid
1498	Ibid	¼ ¼	John, son of John Philipson Wlater Drummond @ £1 Entry £1	Ibid
1499	Ibid	½	Widow of John Philipson and son John @ £2 Grassum £2	Patick Hume of Polwarth @ £2 Grassum £2
1502				
9 yr Lease	Ibid @ £4	½	Ibid @ £4	Ibid @ £4
1504	Ibid		Ibid	Patrick Scott @ £4 Entry Remitted
1510 Feu	?	½	John Philipson @ £1 Entry £5	

LITTLE COLDOCH AND MEADAN

		@ 10/-	@ 10/-	@ 33/4	RENT	GRASSUM
1480	3yr.L	Donald Ranaldson	Ranald Donaldson	Malcolm Drummond	£2-13- 4	£2-13- 4
1486	"	"	"	"	"	"
1488	"		Malcolm Drummond		"	"
1490	"		Malcolm's widow and son Maurice		"	"
1492	"		"		"	"
1499	"		Patrick Murray		"	"
1502	9yr.L		"		£5- 6- 8	£ 5- 6- 8
1507	Remainder of Lease		James Redheuch		"	
1509	F		John Murray of Strowane and wife Margaret		£6-13- 4	£6-13- 4

BUTHNY

			Rent	Grassum
1480	3 yr.L	*Humphray Murray of Abercairny	£ 5- 6- 8	£ 5- 6- 8
1486	"	"	"	"
1488	"	" and his wife Margaret	"	"
1490	"	"	"	"
1492	"	"	"	"
1499	"	"	"	"
1502	9 yr.L	"	£10-13- 4	£10-13- 4
1505		Margaret and Son Charles Murray	"	
1509	F	Charles Murray	£14- 0- 0	£13- 6- 8

DUNDURN

1480	3 yr.L	Finlay Philipson	£22- 0- 0	£22- 0- 0
1486	"	"	£ "	"
1488	"	"	"	"
1490	"	"	"	"
			(Incl. the Mill of Dundurn)	
1492	"	"	£23- 6- 8	£23- 6- 8
1499	"	"	"	"
1502	9 yr.L	"	£46-13- 4	£46-13- 4
1507	3 yr.L	John Philipson	£39-13- 4	£39-13- 4
1510	F	John Philipson and wife Mary	£46-13- 4	NIL Sterlity

CLACHY

1480	3 yr.L	Elizabeth and son David Murray	£ 8-10- 0	£ 8- 0- 0
1486	"	"	"	£ 8- 0- 0
1488	"	"	"	£ 8-10- 0
1490	9 yr.L	Patrick Hepburn	"	NIL
1492	3 yr.L	John Lundy	"	"
		Replaced by Patrick Hume of Polworth	"	"
1499	3 yr.L	Elizabeth, Lady Drummond	"	£ 8-10- 0
1502	9 yr.L	"	£17- 0- 0	£17- 0- 0
1509	F	John, Lord Drummond	£24- 0- 0	£24- 0- 0

LURG

			RENT	GRASSUM
1480	3 yr.L	John Grerson	£ 4- 0- 0	£ 4- 0- 0
1486	"	"	"	£ 2-13- 4
1488	"	"	"	£ 4- 0- 0
1490	"	"	"	£ 2-13- 4
1492	"	"	"	£ 2-13- 4
1499	"	William Drummond	"	£ 4- 0- 0
1502	9 yr.L	William Drummond and son Thomas	£ 6-13- 4	NIL
1509	F	Thomas Drummond	£ 8- 6- 8	£ 8- 6- 8

KINGARTH

1480	3 yr.L	Patrick McCulloch	£ 5- 6- 8	£ 5- 6- 8
1486	"	Sir Willima Murray of Tulibardine	£ "	"
1488	"	James Redheugh	"	"
1490	"	"	"	"
1492	"	"	"	"
1499	"	Duncan"Paterson	"	"
1502	9yr. L	"	£10-13- 4	£10-13- 4
1509	F	"	£13- 6- 8	£13- 6- 8

RITHERNE

1480		?	£ 8- 0- 0	
1486		In hands of James Haldane for 19 yrs.	£ 8- 0- 0	
1488		?		
1490	3 yr.L	William Stirling of Keir	£ 8- 0- 0	£ 8- 0- 0
1492	"	"	"	"
1495	5 yr.L	Thomas Shaw, master cook	"	NIL
1499	3 yr.L	William Stirling of Keir	£ 8- 0- 0	£ 8- 0- 0
1502	9 yr.L	"	£16- 0- 0	£16- 0- 0
1509	F	Luke Stirling	£32- 0- 0	£32- 0- 0

UCHTERTYRE

			RENT	GRASSUM
1480	3 yr .L	Catherine, widow of Patrick Murray	£10-13- 4	£10-13- 4
1486	"	"	"	"
1488	"	"	"	"
1490	"	" and son David Murray	"	"
1492	"	"	"	"
1499	"	"	"	"
1502	9 yr.L	Catherine, David Murray and wife Margaret	£16- 0- 0	£16- 0- 0
1509	F	Margaret and son Patrick Murray	£20- 0- 0	£20- 0- 0

BROADLAND OF BALACH WITH MILL

1480	Claimed in Feu	John Murray of Trenin	£ 4-10- 0	
1486		"	"	
1488	3 yr.L	David Drummond	£ 4-10- 0	£ 4- 10-0
1490	"	John, Lord Drummond	"	"
1492	Claimed in Feu	John Murray of Trenin	"	
1499	"	" (Assigned 3 July to prove claim)	"	
1502	9 yr.L	Thomas Murray, son of John Murray Sir William Murray of Tulibardine	£ 9- 0- 0	£ 9- 0- 0
1509	F	Walter Drummond	£17- 6- 8	£20- 0- 0

. APPENDIX B/3 (c) SELECTED LEASES FROM THE LORDSHIP OF GALLOWAY

EGERNES, CULDERY, ARDECUTE

			RENT	GRASSUM
1482	5 yr.L	John Kennedy of Balirquhame	£20- 0- 0	£20- 0- 0
1489	3 yr.L	"	"	"
1490	"	" and Alexander, son of Sir Alex. Boyd	"	£10- 0- 0
1493	3 yr.L	Alexander Boyd	"	£16-13- 4
1500	"	John Dunbar, heir of Machrum	"	£20- 0- 0
1503	9 yr.L	"	"	£10- 0- 0
1512	5 yr.L	"	"	£20- 0- 0

KNOKINCUR

1482	5 yr.L	George McCulloch	£ 3- 6- 8	£ 1- 0- 0
1489	3 yr.L	"	"	£ 2- 0- 0
1490	"	"	"	£ 2- 0- 0
1493	"	" and son Archibald	"	£ 2. 0- 0
1500	"	Archibald McCulloch	"	£ 2- 0- 0
1503	9 yr.L	"	£ 6-13- 4	NIL
1512	5 yr.L	Thomas Forrester	"	£ 6-13- 4
1513	Continue existing lease	James McCulloch	"	

CLACHRE

1482	5 yr.L	Alex. Mure	£ 4- 6- 8	£ 4- 0- 0
4189	3 yr.L	Widow of Alex. Mure, Eliz. Hamilton	"	£ 6-10- 0
1490	"	"	"	"
1493	"	"	"	NIL
1500	"	" and husband John Mure	"	£ 6-10- 0
1503	9 yr.L	John Mure	£ 6-13- 4	£ 3- 0- 0
1512	5 yr.L	Thomas Forrester	"	£ 6-13- 4

APPENDIX B/3 (d) SELECTION FROM RENTALS OF EARLDOM OF FIFE

AULDLINDORES

1480-1506	Occupied by	John Ballon	@ £24-14- 2	3 chalders, 8 Bolls Wheat 4 " 4 " Barley 1 " 8 " Oats 32 capons, 64 Poultry	
		Through Ballon's death			
1506	3 yr.L	Walter Leslie, king's marischal	@ £24-14- 2		Entry and grassums amounted to cash farms for 3 terms.
	3 yr.L	"	"		Grassum £24-14- 2
1508	"	Alex. Kincragie, husband of Elizabeth Ballon	"		Entry "
		widow of Walter Leslie and Elizabeth			
1510	F	Alex. Kincragie	£50-0-0	1 chalder, 8 Bolls Oats 32 capons 102 Poultry	Entry £80- 0- 0
1512	F	"	£40- 0-0	1 chalder, 8 Bolls Oats 32 capons and 74 Poultry.	

DRUMTENNANT

1487	Occupies by	John Kervour	£ 4- 0- 0	1 chalder 4 bolls Barley 2 " 8 " Oats 18 Poultry	
1495	Claimed in Feu	Thomas Anderson (Assigned 7 July to show rights a the Exchequer)	"		
1502	3 yr.L	Thomas Anderson	"		Grassum 10 Mks Entry 20 Mks
1505	"	"	"		Grassum 10 Mks
1508	"	"	"		"
1510	F	" and wife Elizabeth	£10-0-0 and Kind		Entry £10-0-0

BALBREKY

			RENT		GRASSUM
1482	3 yr.L	Alex. Ramsay	£4- 0- 0	1 chalder 4 Bolls Barley 2 chalders, 8 bolls Oats 24 capons	£ 4- 0- 0
1485	"	"	"		"
1488	"	William Rautoun	"		"
1490	"	Alex. Ramsey	"		"
1492	"	"	"		"
1495	"	"	"		"
1499			"		"
1502		-			

BALBREKY (Contd.)

			RENT	GRASSUM
1503	3 yr. L	Archibald Beaton	£4-0-0 1 chalder, 4 bolls Barley 2 " 8 Bolls Oats 24 capons	£ 4- 0- 0
1508	"	"	"	"
1510	F	"	£8- 0- 0 and Kind	£20- 0- 0

JERVISLAND

1485	3 yr.L	Robert Styrk	Henry Kincraigie	£1- 7- 2	5 bolls,1 firlot Wheat 6 bolls,2 firlots Barley	£ 1- 7- 2
1487	"	"	"		2 geese 6 Poultry	£ 2- 0- 0
1488	"	"	"		"	"
1490	"	"	"		"	"
1492	"	"	"		"	£ 1- 7- 2
1495	"	"	"		"	"
1499	"	"	"		"	"
1502	"	"	"		"	"
1505	"	"	"		"	"
1508	"	"	"		"	"
1510	F	"	and son Robert "	£2-16- 8 and Kind		£ 2-16- 8

RAMORGNY AND LAWFIELD

1482	3 yr.L	Walter Heriot and son Walter	£16- 0- 0		£ 8- 0- 0
1485	"	"	"		"
1487	"	"	£10- 2- 8	1 chalder barley 2 chalders oats	"
1488		?			
1490	"	Walter Heriot and son Alexander	"		"
1492	"	Walter Heriot of Burnturk	"		"
1495	"	" and son Walter	"		"
1499	"	"	£16- 0- 0		"
1502	"	"	"		"
1505	"	"	"		"
1508	"	"	"		"
1511	F	"	£22- 0- 0		£22- 0- 0

MARESTON

			RENT	GRASSUM
1482	Occupation	Thomas Simpson, Sheriff of Fife	£1- 6- 8 1 Chalder 10 Bolls, 2 Firlots 2 Pecks OATS	
1485	3 yr.L	John Rankello and brother David	"	£1- 6- 8
1487	"	Thomas Simpson and wife	"	£2- 0- 0
1488	"	Alex. Hepburn	"	£2- 0- 0
1490	"	"	"	"
1492	"	Thomas Inglis	"	"
1495	"	"	"	"
	This his consent	Andrew Ayton	"	"
1499	3 yr.L	"	"	"
1502	"	"	"	"
1505	"	"	"	"
1508	"	"	"	"
1511	F	John Rankello	£4- 0- 0 and Kind	£4- 0- 0

APPENDIX B/3 (e) SELECTION FROM RENTAL OF ETTRICK FOREST

GAITHOPE (2 steads)

				RENT	GRASSUM
1484	3 yr.L	David Tait, son of Tait of Pyrne		£12- 0- 0	£20- 0- 0
1486	"	"		£12- 0- 0	£16- 4- 0
1488	"	Philip Nesbit	Thomas Wawan of Staneston	"	£16- 0- 0
Pater	"	George Tait, son of David Tait		"	"
1490	"	"		"	"
1493	"	David Tait, son of George Tait		"	"
1499	"	½ John Murray & David Pringle Occupied with 360 royal sheep at an annual farm of £50-0-0.	½ Margaret Liddale and son Alex. Tait A £6-0-0 Grassum £8-2-0		
1501	9 yr.L	Alex. Lord Hume		100 Mks.	
1510	F	Alex. Tait of Pyrne		£44- 0- 0	£44- 0- 0
1511	F	James Stewart of Tracquair		"	"

SINGLE AND ERNHEUCH (2½ Steads)

			RENT	GRASSUM
1484	3 yr.L	Walter Turnbull of Gargunnock	£15- 0- 0	£24- 0- 0
1486	"	"	"	£18- 0- 0
1488	"	Thomas Hume of Langshaw	"	"
1490	"	"	"	"
1493	"	Patrick Hume of Fastcastle	"	"
1499	"	Sir Robert Ker	"	"
1501	9 yr.L	Alex. Lord Hume	£53- 0- 0	NIL
1510	F	Andrew Ker	£50- 0- 0	£50- 0- 0

EASTSTEAD OF WARMWOOD

1484	3 yr.L	Alex. Murray	£ 6- 0- 0	£ 6-13- 4
1486	"	Henry Alan William Murray, bother of Alex Murray	"	£10- 0- 0
1486	"	Henry Alan	"	"
1488	"	John Hume, son of Hume of Ayton	"	£ 8- 0- 0
1490	"	"	"	"
1493	"	Alex. Lord Hume	"	"
1499	"	Robert Turnbull	"	"
1501	9 yr.L	"	£14- 0- 0	NIL
1510	F	"	£18- 0- 0	£18- 0- 0
		(Cancelled)		
	F	"	£16- 0- 0	£16- 0- 0

AIKWOOD

1484	3 yr.L	Robert Rutherford and son Ninian	£ 6- 0- 0	£10- 0- 0
1486		Lease reserved through contention between suitors		
1488	"	John Towers of Inverleith, doorkeeper	£ 6- 0- 0	£ 8- 0- 0
1490	"	Patrick Hume of Polworth	"	"
1493	"	Alex. Lord Hume	"	"
1499	"	"	"	"
1501	9 yr.L	"	£21- 0- 0	£ NIL
1510	F	"	£30- 0- 0	£30- 0- 0
		(Cancelled)		
	F	"	£26-13- 4	£26-13- 4

HOLYWELL

			RENT	GRASSUM
1484	3 yr.L	Margaret Shaw and Patrick Crichton	£ 6- 0- 0	£20- 0- 0
1488	"	Patrick Crichton of Cranstone	£ 6- 0- 0	£ 8- 0- 0
1490	"	"	"	"
1493	"	"	"	£16- 0- 0
1499	"	"	" "	£ 8- 0- 0
1510	F	Patrick, son of above	£26- 0- 0	NIL

APPENDIX B/3 (f) - THE CONVERSION OF ROYAL PROPERTY IN ETTRICK FOREST FROM LEASEHOLD TO FEUFARM

FAMILIES	No of Places for 3 yr. Lease	@	No.of Places for Feu	@
Scott	8½	£51	9	£169-13-4
Hepburn	5½	£33	3½	£70-0-0
Hume	9	£54	10½	£335-13-4
Cranstone	2½	£15	6½	£171-0-0
Crichton	2	£12	4	£281- 6-8
Liddale	2	£12	2	£ 60- 0-0
Pringle	4½	£29	4¾	£121- 6-8
Ker	11	£66	8½	£217- 0-0
Stewart	1	£ 6	3	£119- 0-0
Murray	3	£18	5½	£127-10-0
Tait	½	£ 3	-	-
King's Sheep	7	£42	-	-

APPENDIX B/3 (h) SMALL TENANTS IN EARLDOM OF FIFE, (ER, ix, 587-91, xiii 610-15)

This included tenants traceable from 1481-2 to 1508 in selected areas in order to trace variations in the size of such holdings and the extent of dissection of leeses immediately of the crown.

		1481-2		1508
Ardate	Thomas Mailville	3/16	John Mailville	1/16
	John Mailville	1/16	John Mailville	1/16
Cathyl	John Gourlaw	¼ + 1/32		¼
	John Williamson	⅛ + 1/64	Henry Williamson	1/16
	" " (younger)	1/32		
	John Thompson	⅛		⅛
	Thomas Atkinson	1/32	John Atkinson	⅛
	"	3/32		
	Nichole Rymore	1/16	Henry Rymore	1/16
	John Fatcals	1/16		1/16
Casche	Andrew Laigne	⅛ + 1/32	Mary Laign and son	⅛
	Walter Hertside	1/32		1/16
	Henry Towche	1/16		⅛
	Aitkin Thompson	1/16	Agnes and Nichol Thompson	1/16
	David Hunyman	⅛	Mary and John Hunyman	3/32
			William Hunyman	1/32
	Robert Lawson	1/32		1/32
	John Malcdm	1/16		1/16+1/32
H.Quart of	John Robertson	3/24		3/24
Uchtermukty	Peter Dempster	1/6	Henry Dempster	1/6
	Marion Bost	1/6	John Bost	1/6
	Alex. Dawson	1/12	Stephen and John Dawson	1/12
	Thomas Stirk	1/24	Thomas Stirk	1/24
	William Rankin	1/24	Isobelle Tankin	1/24
	Thomas Gilmour	1/6+1/24	James Gilmour Alex. Gilmour	1/12 3/24

APPENDIX B/3 (i)

POLITICAL CHANGE IN LEASE DISTRIBUTION WITHIN EARLDOM OF STRATHEARN

(ER, ix, 570-3, 627-31, x, 639-44, 690-5)

FAMILY	Before 1486	1488 Gross Farm	1492	1505-13 Rent Rise through Long Lease of 1502 or Feuing
Murray	£200- 5- 0	£ 41-18- 4	£159- 8- 4	£346- 1- 8
Drummond	£ 49-10- 0	£142- 9- 8	£ 67-16- 8	£206-15- 0
Oliphant	-	£ 34-13- 4	£ 6-13- 4	-
Redheuch	£ 10- 0- 0	£ 29- 6- 8	£ 28- 0- 0	£ 60- 0- 8

Amount of Portion of Land Lost by Murray in 1488	27
Amount regained by 1492	20
Number of examples of Continuity of Family 1480-1513	14

APPENDIX B/3 (j)

List of Grants of Leases within the Earldom of Fife, as recorded in the Register of the Privy Seal. (RSS. Vol 1)

No. of Charter	Date	Land Involved	Leesee	No. of Years
67	25 Aug 1496	Balkerose and Mill	sir William Stirling of Ker and wife Margaret	7
148	21 Oct 1497	½ of the lands of town of Dunmure	Andrew Ayeton	5
231	16 July 1498	Camerone and Mill of Freuchy	John Hiltson and son William	19
256	15 Sept	Balbreky	David Prat	Life
263	2 Oct	Ballinkirk	John Gibb	5
274	20 Oct	Woodmylne etc.	Robert Arnot	5
313	6 Jan 1498-9	Nethir Reras	David Beaton	9
329	30 Jan	West half of Dunmure	Andrew Ayton	9
408	4 Aug 1499	¼ of Murdocarny	David Swan	?
452	28 Jan 1499-1500	3/32 of Kings Barns	John Cawart, his son James and wife Elizabeth	3
481	22 Feb	Camerone	Rose Arnot and son John Abercrombie	9
820	10 May 1502	Newtown of Markinsche	John Multrar and wife Marion	9

APPENDIX B/3 (j) contd.

No.of Charter	Date	Land Involved	Leesee	No.of Years
1229	23 Feb 1505-6	Thomastoun etc.	Robert Moncrieff and wife Isobelle	9
1639	15 March 1507-8	Camerone	Rose Arnot and son John Abercrombie	9
2373	20 Feb 1511-2	Newtoun of Reras	William Kynbuk	Life
2472	31 Jan 1512-3	¼ of Murthocarny	David Swan and Thomas Logy	9

APPENDIX B/3 (k) (ER, Vols vi to xiii)

The grassums charged to Chamberlain of Galloway from 1458

1458-9	£ 54-13- 4
1459-60	£ 81- 5- 7
1462-9	£354-12- 1
1470-1	£235-12- 8
1475-6	£393-13- 4
1477-8	£339- 6- 8
1479-80	£ 18-16- 8
1484-5	£116- 6- 8
1485-6	£ 6- 0- 0
1488-9	£216-11- 8
1489-90	£ 10- 0- 0
1490-1	£455- 7- 4
Dec 1493-94	£ 18-10- 0
April 1497-8	£681- 2- 8
Jan 1500-01	£130-16- 8
1501-2	£ 43- 6- 8
May 1503-4	£213-10- 8
1506-7	£ 56-17- 8
1507-8	£ 13- 0- 0
1508-9	£ 30- 0- 0
1512-13	£ 10- 0- 0

APPENDIX B/3 (1)

Forest statutes recorded before the lease of the lands of Ettrick Forest on 30 April 1499. (ER, xi, 393-5).

The punctis to be inquirit at the inqueist

1. Scab, waitht, lipoir, pikry. Thir are the iiij hed punctis.
2. Tappyn of the kingis landis.
3. Oppressouris of the kingis tennentis.
4. Purprisaris apon the kingis landis.
5. Gif ony landis be haldin fra the king and nocht in his rentale.
6 Quhat landis ar occupiit be the kingis tenentis contenit in his rentale with thair awin proper gudis and howmikill.
7. Gif ony malwz or dewiteis ar rasit upon the kingis landis that cumis nocht till his awne use.
8. Gif ony extorsions be maid be the officiaris upoun the kingis tenentis.
9. The distruccione of grenewod, and destroyaris of wod with thair maling. Unlauchful beistis, as gait, swyne.
10. Tenentis that are nocht of power to labour thair malingis with thair awne gudis.
11. Ony wedowis mariit without the kingis licence.
12. Quhat hereyeldis are fallin sen the last set.
13. The brekaris of the commone.
14. Gif ony landis be occupiit without tak of the king, and gif thare be ony teling or awing within ony woodis forestis pertening to the king in properte, and ar nocht kepit with sik fredome as has been usit.
15. Gif ther be ony that purches lordschip upon the kingis tenentis.
16. Slaaris of the kingis der. Telyne, sawing, huntin for the slauchter of deir, yardis, schelis, undersettillis, haggaris, pelaris of bark, colbymaris, turnouris, comparis, schutaris.
17. Item gif ony be pur in thair awne necligence throw the quhilk thai unfficient tennentis.
18. Quha has pait thair malis, gressounez, fermes.

Quhat crewis are haldin up again the actis of Parliament and be quhat personis. Item gif the forestis be kepit foreslike or feif thai be occupiit be ony personis.

Ultimo Aprilis anno Domini etc. Nonagesimonono, publicatum in pretorio de Edinburgh.

Primo. It is thocht expedient that the vj steidis of office be takin in the kingis handis and the comptrollar mak officiaris to gadder in the malis and extretis of the courtis and pay thaim thair feis thairfor, and ordance men to gev in the entres of the wardis in ilk court for the kepin of the forrest forrestlike as he will ansueir thairfor, and quhilkis officiaris ordanti be him sall considir the destruccion of wod and der.

'Secundo. Item it is thocht expedient for the kepin of the said forrest forrestlike and for the haning of wod and der that thar be na fyris upon ane steid bot thre allanerlie, the quhilkis salbe two bowis and j sper to the kingis ost efter the auld consuetude.

Tercio. Item it is thocht expedient that ilk forrest keip and have the der and wod within his steid as he will answer to the king under the pain of tynsale of his steid and eschaetin of his gudis being thairupon.

Quarto. Item that na forestar hald undir him in his steid haggar, flegeour, turnour, barcar, colebyrnar, pelar of bark, scab, pikar, wrychtis, swyn, nor giat, undir paid of tynsale of his sted, eschaetin of the gudis apon the said steid, nor yit he sall nothir geve nor sell ony maner of wod till ony personis, nor yit cut nor distroy himself under the sammyn panis bot till his awne neidis within the said forrest.

Quinto. Item for the schutaris, slaaris of calfis, foneis, or rakiddis, or slaaris of dier be hunting or ony uthir maner of way within the bonids of the forrest of the said steid quhar the der or best is slane sall othir find ane slaare for the sammyn or ellis be punist tharfor himself and pay the auld unlaw but favour.

Sexto. Item anent the kepin of the said forrest, it is thocht expedient that thair be na telin, sawin, delfyne, or ony maner of corne with the forsaid forrest under the pain of tynsale of the steid and eschaeting of the said corne and gudis being thairupon.

Septimo. Item it is thocht expedient that thair be na mureburne nor na maner of yardis nor dikyne of na maner of wod fra thinfurtht except it be of thorne, saucht, or erde, undir the paid of tynsale of his stakkis quhar it beis fund.

Octavo. It is thocht expedient thar be na steid of the forrest set to ony maner of persone but gif he remain thairupon himself or ellis ordane ane sufficient tenant and nychtbour thairto that beis abill to keip the steid nychtbourlike accordin to the auld statutuis and undirly the ordinance abon writtin.

Nono, Item it is thocht expedient that the balye hald foure balye courtis in the year at the lest for the seing of the said thingis and reforming of plantis of nychtbourhed and uthiris and ma gif it neidis, and see gif ilk steid beis boding with two bowis and a sper with hors and ger as accordis thairto as saidis, and als mony as beis findin falyeing in the said ordinance he sall put thaim in the rolment of his court and deliver the sammyn to the commissionaris of the Beltan and Alhallow court quhen thair are haldin under the pain of tynsale of his office and all his stedis gif he has ony.

Decimo. Item it is thocht expedient that becaus it is plenyeit that the marchis and the induellaris within the bondis abour the said forrest distroyis the wod and der grettumlie, for the quhilkis thair has ben na remeid this langtyme to gret prejudice and hurt of the king and his forrest and landis, that thair be yeirelie ane bond court haldin be the kingis comptrollar and commissaris for the reforming and remeid of the said hurtis and skaith.

Undecimo. Item it is thocht expedient that fense efter the auld consuetude be kepit unde the pane of tynsale of the steid and exchæeting of the gudis.

Duodecimo. Item it is thocht expedient that gif it happinnis ony forrester within the siad forrest to tak remission or respitt fra thin furth for common theif, pikry, or reset thairof or happinnis to be convict thairwith, that thain his stedis salbe forfalt, and his gudis being thairupoun salbe eschaettit without ony uthir proces of law and the stedis wacand.

And all thir statutis above weittin togidder with the auld statutis of the forrest be observit and kepit under the panis contenit in the sammyne and this assedacion underwrittin maid be the commissaris efter the forme of the said statutis and publist to the forrestaris in the plane court in the tolbouth of Edinburgh the day and yer above exprimit.

APPENDIX B/3 (m)

Anno domini Millesimo quingentesimoquinto xxiii to Martii.

The Compt of the Grange of Dernway. (ER, xii, 672-3)

In primis the first stak of aitis the pruf was ii ferlotis ii peccis. Item the secund stak aitis the pruf v ferlotis iii peccis. Item the therd stak aitis pruf vi ferlotis ii peccis. Item the ferd stak aitis pruf (connacavyll) v ferlotis iii peccis. Item thr fyft stak aitis pruf i boll ii peccis. Item the vi stak aitis pruf iii bollis iii ferlotis i pec. Item the vii stak aitis pruf ii bollis i ferlot i½ peccis. Item the viii stak aitis pruf v ferlotis. Item the ix stak aitis pruf (connacavyll) v ferlotis iii peccis. Item the x stak aitis pruf ii bollis iii ferlotis. Item the xi stak aitis pruf ii bollis iii ferlotis. Summa of the pruf xx bollis ii ferlotis i pec ½ pec.

Expense ejusdem.

Item to v plaumen v chelder atis. Item to the schiphird xiii bollis atis. Item to the bowman viii bollis atis. Item to Rannald for the yet kepen vi bollis atis. Item to Brande for the mokyn ix bollis aitis. Item to the nuris to mak grotis i boll aitis. Item to Valter Douglas kepand the place v ferlotis aitis. Item to Montmam ii bollis aitis. Item to the smyth v ferlotis aitis. Item to the Jhone Ayr vachman vi ferlotis aitis. Item to the vyndoustaris iiii bollis aitis. Summa, ix celdre iii bolle. Item to the seid xvi celdre vii bolle i ferlota.

Ordium.

Item a stak of ber castyn the pruf druv to ii ferlotis ii peccis.. Item iiii stakis of ber in the yard. Item two stakis and ane half of quheit the tother half aitis.

DERNWAY ANNO DOMINI MILLESIMO QUINGENTESIMOQUARTO XXIII° MARTII.

Item in v plewis 1 oxin. Item with Jhone McGilmwell bowman iii ky with cauff iii young ky with cauff xiii yeld ky two ky with the nuris and the barne v ky with the schiphird ii of thaim with cauff. Item with Jhone McGillemoyll of iii yeiris auldis viii noyt. Item with him of two yeiris auldis vi not. Item with hime of cauffis vi. Item with the schiphird of ane yeir auld ii styrkis. Item with ane of the ky that the nuris has i cauff. Item with Johne McGillemoyll i bowyll. Item with Andro Mulisone and Jhone Brothy of ii yeiris ald i ster.

The scheipe. Item with the schiphird lxxxxxxvi yowis. Item with him xlii vedderis. Item with him lxiiii oggis. Item with him of yeiris auldis ix scheip. Summa totalis liffand xi^{xx} xi auld x young.

ANNO DOMINI MILLESIMO QUINGENTE SIMOQUINTO

Item the feing of the plewmen of Dernway and Berne. Item in primis James Archbald i plewcht with his pairt of the Birne ii hukkis.. Item Nicoll i plewcht with a pairt of the Birne ii hukkis. Item Andro Bege i plewcht a pairt of the Birne ii hukkis. Item Steine Boureman to the half of the Birne except the v plewmen.

APPENDIX B/4 (a) TRANSFER OF BURGH RETURNS FROM LEASEHOLD TO FEUFARM
(ER, Vols. ii, iii)

	1360s	1400s	
Haddington	£ 3- 6- 8	£ 15.- 0- 0	F
Ayr	2-13- 4	20- 0- 0	F
Pebbles	3-13- 4	8-13- 4	L
Edinburgh	34-13- 4	34-13- 4	F
Linlithgow	5- 6- 8	5- 0- 0	F
Stirling	10- 0- 0	16- 0- 0	F
Rutherglen	8-13- 4	13- 0- 0	F
Perth	40- 0- 0	80- 0- 0	F
Forfar	9- 6- 8	8-13- 4	F
Aberdeen	213- 6- 8	213- 6- 8	F
Montrose	6-13- 4	16- 0- 0	F
Crail	12- 6- 8	11- 0- 0	F
Inverness	40- 0- 0	53- 6- 8	F
Lanark	10- 0- 0	6- 0- 0	F
Banff	30- 6- 8	33- 6- 8	F
Inverkeithing	6- 0- 0	5- 0- 0	F
Dumbarton	7- 0- 0	8- 0- 0	L
Dundee	13- 6- 8	20- 0- 0	F
Total 18			
Number Feued	2	16	
TOTALS	£456-13- 4	£567- 0- 0	

APPENDIX B/4 (b)

Real Crown Income from Burgh Accounts, divided into Annual Averages of 4 years. (ER, Vol IV-XIII)

1409-10	1413-4	1417-8	1421-2	1425-6	1429-30
£ 22- 0- 0	£ 15-14- 7	£ 12-11- 0	£ 14-12- 9	£103-13-11	£210-11-11

1433-4	1437-8	1441-2	1445-6	1498-50	1453-4
£136- 3-10	£ 56-19- 5	£ 35- 0- 0	£ 73- 1- 9	£ 86- 2- 5	£ 61-11- 0

1457-8	1461-2	1465-6	1469-70	1473-4	1477-8
£ 78- 6- 2	£109-17- 1	£142-19-11	£170-15- 7	£115-10- 5	£155- 9- 1

1481-2	1485-6	1489-90	1493-4	1497-8	1501-2
£224-17- 9	£117-12- 3	£ 88-16-11	£ 82-10- 2	£196- 1- 1	£122-15- 7

1505-6	1509-10	1512-13
£148- 6- 8	£129-12-10	£ 95-16-11.

APPENDIX B/4 (c)

DETAILS OF BURGH BAILLIE ACCOUNTS

Average Account 1457-60 (ER. Vol VI)

	Gross Burgh Farm	Total Annual Charge	Assignations and other Allowances	Ecclesiastical Pensions	Lay Pensions	Real Revenue
Dumfries	£ 20- 1- 0	£ 20- 1- 0	£ -	£ 20- 1- 0	£ -	£ -
Ayr	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	-	20- 0- 0	-	-
Renfrew	5- 6- 8	5- 6- 8	-	-	-	5- 6- 8
Dumbarton	8- 0- 0	8- 0- 0	-	7-13- 4	-	0- 6- 8
Rutherglen	13- 0- 0	13- 0- 0	-	11- 0- 0	-	2- 0- 0
Dundee	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	-	12- 6- 8	7- 0- 0	0-13- 4
Edinburgh	34-13- 4	34-13- 4	-	31-13- 4	-	3- 0- 0
Irvine	7- 6- 8	7- 6- 8	-	-	1- 6- 8	6- 0- 0
Cuper	17- 6- 8	17- 6- 8	-	17- 6- 8	-	-
Perth	80- 0- 0	80- 0- 0	-	69- 5- 4	10-14- 8	-
North Berwick	1- 0- 0	1- 0- 0	-	-	-	1- 0- 0
Dunbar	4- 0- 0	4- 0- 0	-	-	-	-
Montrose	16- 0- 0	16- 0- 0	-	14-17- 4	-	1- 2- 8
Peebles	9- 6- 8	9- 6- 8	-	1- 6- 8	-	8- 0- 0
Haddington	15- 0- 0	15- 0- 0	-	5- 0- 0	-	10- 0- 0
Kinghorn	2-10- 0	2-10- 0	-	-	2- 0- 0	0-10- 0
Stirling	16- 0- 0	16- 0- 0	-	15- 6- 8	-	0-13- 4
Inverness	53- 6- 8	53- 6- 8	-	10- 8- 8	42-18- 0	-
Linlithgow	5- 0- 0	5- 0- 0	-	0-13- 4	-	4- 6- 8
Inverkeithing	5- 0- 0	5- 0- 0	-	-	-	5- 0- 0
Banff	33- 6- 8	33- 6- 8	5- 0- 0	3- 6- 8	11- 0- 8	13-19- 4
Aberdeen	213- 6- 8	213- 6- 8	-	54-13- 4	113- 6- 8	35- 6- 8
Lanark	6- 0- 0	6- 0- 0	-	2- 0- 0	-	4- 0- 0
Jedburgh	4- 0- 0	4- 0- 0	-	-	-	4- 0- 0
Forfar	8-13- 4	8-13- 4	-	2- 0- 0	6-13- 4	-
Wigtown	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	-	6-13- 4	-	13- 6- 8
Crail	11- 0- 0	11- 0- 0	-	2-13- 4	5- 0- 0	3- 6- 8
Kirkcudbright	6-13- 4	6-13- 4	-	6-13- 4	-	-
TOTALS	£655-11- 0	£655-11- 0	£ 5- 0- 0	£314-19- 0	£200- 0- 0	£121-18- 8

Average - Accounts 1507-1510 (ER. Vol. XII-XIII)

	Gross Burgh Farm	Total Annual Charge	General Allowances	Ecclesiastical Pensions	Lay Pensions	Real Revenue
Dumfries	20- 0-0	£ 20- 1- 0	£ -	£ 13-17- 0	£ 6-13- 4	£ -
Ayr	20- 0-0	20- 0- 0	-	20- 0- 0	-	-
Renfrew	5- 6-8	5- 6- 8	-	-	-	5- 6- 8
Dumbarton	8- 0-0	8- 0- 0	-	7-13- 4	-	0- 6- 8
Rutherglen	13- 0- 0	13- 0- 0	-	11- 0- 0	-	2- 0- 0
Dundee	20- 0-0	20- 0- 0	-	12- 6- 8	7- 0- 0	0- 6- 8
Edinbrugh	34-13-4	34-13- 4	-	31-13- 4	-	3- 0- 0
Irvine	7- 6-8	7- 6- 8	-	-	1- 6- 8	6- 0- 0
Cuper	17- 6-8	17- 6- 8	-	17- 6- 8	-	-
Perth	80- 0-0	80- 0- 0	-	69- 5- 4	10-14- 8	-
North Berwick	1- 0-0	1- 0- 0	-	-	-	1- 0- 0
Dunbar	-	-	-	-	-	-
Montrose	16- 0-0	16- 0- 0	-	14-17- 4	-	1- 2- 8
Peebles	9- 6-8	9-10- 0	-	1- 6- 8	8- 0- 0	0- 3- 4
Haddington	15- 0- 0	15- 0- 0	-	5- 0- 0	-	10- 0- 0
Kinghorn	2-10- 0	2-10- 0	-	-	2- 0- 0	0-10- 0
Stirling	16- 0- 0	16- 0- 0	-	15- 6- 8	-	0-13- 4
Inverness	53- 6-8	57- 6- 8	-	10- 8- 8	-	46-18- 0
Linlithgow	5- 0-0	5- 0- 0	-	0-13- 4	-	4- 6- 8
Inverkeithing	5- 0-0	5- 0- 0	-	-	-	5- 0- 0
Banff	33- 6-8	33- 6- 8	-	3- 6- 8	16-13- 4	13- 6- 8
Aberdeen	213- 6-8	213- 6- 8	-	54-13- 4	150- 0- 0	8-13- 4
Lanark	6- 0-0	6- 0- 0	-	2- 0- 0	4- 0- 0	-
Jedburgh	3-0- 0	3- 0- 0	-	-	-	3- 0- 0
Forfar	8-13-4	8-13- 4	- -	8-13- 4	-	-
Wigtown	20- 0-0	20- 0- 0	-	6-13- 4	10- 0- 0	3- 6- 8
Crail	11- 0-0	11- 0- 0	-	2-13- 4	5- 0- 0	3- 6- 8
Kirkidbright	6-13-4	6-13- 4	-	6-13- 4	-	-
Lauder	5- 7-4	5- 7- 4	-	-	5- 0- 8	0- 6- 8
Nairn	10- 0-0	10- 0- 0	-	-	-	10- 0- 0
Rothsay	6- 0-0	6- 0- 0	-	6- 0- 0	-	-
Lochmaben	1- 5-0	1- 5- 0	1- 5- 0	-	-	-
TOTALS	£688-16-8	£705- 1- 0	£ 7- 5- 0	£339-18- 4	£226- 8- 8	£131- 7- 4

APPENDIX B/4 (d)

Variation of Assessment of Individual Burghs for Tax Purposes and Feufarm. (ER, iv, 639-666)

	King's Ransom Contribution 1435-6		Feu Ferme of 15th Century	
Edinburgh	10,000 Nobles	1	4	£34-13- 4
Dundee	5,700	2	6	20- 0- 0
Aberdeen	5,700	2	1	213- 6- 8
Linlithgow	4,000	4	19	5- 0- 0
Perth	2,448	5	2	80-0- 0
Montrose	1,640	6	9	16- 0- 0
Stirling	1,620	7	9	16- 0- 0
Cuper	1,600	8	8	17- 6- 8
Lanark	1,508	9	17	6- 0- 0
Haddington	1,220	10	11	15- 0- 0
Inverness	660	11	3	53- 6- 8
Peebles	344	12	14	9- 6- 8
Irvine	310	13	16	7- 6- 8
Inverkeithing	240	14	19	5- 0- 0
Dumbarton	200	15	15	8- 0- 0
Crail	200	15	13	11- 0- 0
Banff	180	17	5	33- 6- 8
Ayr	142	18	6	20- 0- 0
Renfrew	120	19	18	5- 6- 8
North Berwick	100	20	21	1- 0- 0
Rutherglen	80	21	12	13- 0- 0

APPENDIX B/5 (a) — LIST OF EXPORT DUTIES. (1406-1513)

Wool	26/8 @ Sack	(ER, ix, LXX)
Woolfells	13/4 @ 100 Pelts (Long Hundred or 120)	(ER, ix, LXX)
Hides	4 marks @ Last	(ER, ix, LXX)
'Metrik' Skeins	6d each	(APS, i, 6)
'Fulmartis' Skeins	8d @ 10	(")
'Cunying' Skins	1/- @ 100	(")
Otter Skins	6d @ 10	(")
Tod Skins	6d @ 10	(")
Hart and Hind Skins	1/- @ 10	(")
(Dias and Rais' Skins	4d @ 10	(")
Salmon	2/6 in the £1 (APS, ii, 8) 1466, 3/- @ Barrel (ER, vii, 430) 1481, 4/- @ Barrel (ER, ix, 148)	
Cloth	2/- in the £1 (APS, ii, 8)	
Horses, Sheep, Cattle	1/- in the £1 (APS, ii, 8)	
Shorlings	6/8 @ 100	(ER, iv, CXXIX)
Footfells	3/4 @ 100	(")
Scaldings	3/4 @ 100	(")
Lentrinware	1/- @ 100	(")
Herring	4/- @ Last (Taken and Barrelled by Natives)	(APS, ii, 6)*
	6/- @ Last (" " " " Foreigners)	(")*
Red Herring	4d @ 1000	(")*
Fresh Herring	1d @ 1000	(")*

* By 1482 the duty on herring was raised from 6d to 1/- @ Barrel (ER, ix, 197)

Salt	1/- @ Chalder	(ER, vii, 36)			
Coal	1/4 @ Chalder	(ER, xi, 55)			
Oil	2/- @ Barrel	(ER, viii, 118)	1505	3/- @ Barrel	(ER, xii, 372)
Pitch and Tar	9d @ Barrel	(ER, xi, 121)	1501	1/- @ Barrel	(ER, xi, 375)
Suet	4/- @ Barrel	(ER, ix, 225)	1444	5/- @ Barrel	(ER, x, 459)
Keling ('Mulones')	2/- @ 100	(ER, vii, 379)			
Cod (Salted)	£1 @ 1000	(ER, xii, 372)			
English Imports	2/6 in the £1	(APS, ii, 8)			

APPENDIX B/5 (b)

Total Gross Custom Returns 1405-6 to 1513. Calaculated through Average over a Four Year Period

	1406-10	1410-14	1414-18	1418-22	GAP	1424-8	Only 4 Years Recorded 1428-34
4 Year Average	£3,791	£4,303	£3,858	£2,711	-	£5,820	£5,670

	1434-8	1438-42	1442-6	1446-50	1450-4	1454-8	1458-62
4 Year Average	£3,992	£1,192	£3,147	£3,726	£2,387	£2,028	£2,563

	1462-6	1466-70	1470-4	1474-8	1478-82	1482-6	1486-90
4 Year Average	£3,278	£3,271	£3,074	£3,283	£3,085	£2,278	£2,523

	1490-4	1494-8	1498-1502	1502-6	1506-10	1510-3
4 Year Average	£2,632	£2,642	£3,301	£3,003	£3,617	£3,074

APPENDIX B/5 (c) Gross Customs Returns of Individual Burghs (ER, i, 75-83, IV)

1327		1425-34 Annual Average		1487-93 Approx. Annual Average	
Berwick	£ 673	Edinburgh	£2,749	Edinburgh	£1,753
Edinburgh	439	Linlithgow	679	Aberdeen	314
Aberdeen	350	Aberdeen	627	Dundee	136
Dundee	240	Haddington	462	Dumbarton	88
Perth	108	Dundee	415	Haddington	73
Linlithgow	14	Perth	336	Perth	67
Cupar	13	Montrose	111	Montrose	39
Inverkeithing	8	Cupar	104	Dysart	34
Ayr	3	Stirling	81	Cupar	23
Stirling	3	North Berwick	74	Crail and Pittenweem	22
		Dunbar	60	Stirling	18
		Inverkeithing	56	Linlithgow	17
		Banff	34	Ayr	10
		Inverness	32	Dunbar	10
		Forres and Elgin	28	Wigtown	8
		Ayr	18	Arbroath	7
		Arbroath	10	North Berwick	6
		Dumbarton	8	Inverkeithing	6
		Crail	5	Kirkcudbright	5
				Kinghorn	3
TOTALS	£1,851		£5,889		£2,639

APPENDIX B/5 (d) Relation between the 'Reddendo' Attached to Customs Leases and the Gross Annual Returns for the Years Immediately before the alteration of Tenure.

	Lease 'Reddendo'		Annual Average of Preceeding Four Years	Last Year of Lease
Haddington	£120- 0- 0	(1507)	£ 88	1512
Dysart	20- 0- 0	(1505)	29	until 1513
Perth	140- 0- 0	(1506)	97	1509
Linlithgow	33- 6- 8	(1508)	28	1509
Kirkcudbright and Wigtown	100- 0- 0	(1505)	29	1509
Cuper	24- 0- 0	(1504)	13	until 1513
Dundee	182- 6- 8	(1505)	136	1509
Northern Burghs	50- 0- 0	(1505)	No Recent Record	until 1513

APPENDIX B/5 (e) Real Income Paid from Custom's Accounts to Central Fiscal Officials 1406-1513. (Calculated by the Annual Average Total for a Span of 4 Years).

	1405/6-10	1410-14	1414-18	1418-22	1422-6	1426-30	1430-4	1434-8
Custumars	£1,856	£2,312	£1,578	£1,002	£3,449	£2,883	£2,841	£ 988

	1438-42	1442-6	1446-50	1450-4	1454-8	1458-62	1462-6	1466-70
Custumars	£ 188	£1,384	£1,200	£ 901	£ 710	£1,111	£2,365	£2,144

	1470-4	1474-8	1478-82	1482-6	1486-90	1490-4	1494-8	1498-1502
Custumars	£1,914	£2,118	£1,793	£1,543	£1,934	£1,940	£2,039	£2,611

	1502-6	1506-10	1510-13 (3 yrs)
Custumars	£2,326	£2,494	£2,094

APPENDIX B/5 (d) Relation between the 'Reddendo' Attached to Customs Leases and the Gross Annual Returns for the Years Immediately before the alteration of Tenure.

	Lease 'Reddendo'		Annual Average of Preceeding Four Years	Last Year of Lease
Haddington	£120- 0- 0	(1507)	£ 88	1512
Dysart	20- 0- 0	(1505)	29	until 1513
Perth	140- 0- 0	(1506)	97	1509
Linlithgow	33- 6- 8	(1508)	28	1509
Kirkcudbright and Wigtown	100- 0- 0	(1505)	29	1509
Cuper	24- 0- 0	(1504)	13	until 1513
Dundee	182- 6- 8	(1505)	136	1509
Northern Burghs	50- 0- 0	(1505)	No Recent Record	until 1513

APPENDIX B/5 (e) Real Income Paid from Custom's Accounts to Central Fiscal Officials 1406-1513. (Calculated by the Annual Average Total for a Span of 4 Years).

	1405/6-10	1410-14	1414-18	1418-22	1422-6	1426-30	1430-4	1434-8
Custumars	£1,856	£2,312	£1,578	£1,002	£3,449	£2,883	£2,841	£ 988

	1438-42	1442-6	1446-50	1450-4	1454-8	1458-62	1462-6	1466-70
Custumars	£ 188	£1,384	£1,200	£ 901	£ 710	£1,111	£2,365	£2,144

	1470-4	1474-8	1478-82	1482-6	1486-90	1490-4	1494-8	1498-1502
Custumars	£1,914	£2,118	£1,793	£1,543	£1,934	£1,940	£2,039	£2,611

	1502-6	1506-10	1510-13 (3 yrs)
Custumars	£2,326	£2,494	£2,094

APPENDIX B/5 (d) Relation between the 'Reddendo' Attached to Customs Leases and the Gross Annual Returns for the Years Immediately before the alteration of Tenure.

	Lease 'Reddendo'		Annual Average of Preceeding Four Years	Last Year of Lease
Haddington	£120- 0- 0	(1507)	£ 88	1512
Dysart	20- 0- 0	(1505)	29	until 1513
Perth	140- 0- 0	(1506)	97	1509
Linlithgow	33- 6- 8	(1508)	28	1509
Kirkcudbright and Wigtown	100- 0- 0	(1505)	29	1509
Cuper	24- 0- 0	(1504)	13	until 1513
Dundee	182- 6- 8	(1505)	136	1509
Northern Burghs	50- 0- 0	(1505)	No Recent Record	until 1513

APPENDIX B/5 (e) Real Income Paid from Custom's Accounts to Central Fiscal Officials 1406-1513. (Calculated by the Annual Average Total for a Span of 4 Years).

	1405/6-10	1410-14	1414-18	1418-22	1422-6	1426-30	1430-4	1434-8
Custumars	£1,856	£2,312	£1,578	£1,002	£3,449	£2,883	£2,841	£ 988

	1438-42	1442-6	1446-50	1450-4	1454-8	1458-62	1462-6	1466-70
Custumars	£ 188	£1,384	£1,200	£ 901	£ 710	£1,111	£2,365	£2,144

	1470-4	1474-8	1478-82	1482-6	1486-90	1490-4	1494-8	1498-1502
Custumars	£1,914	£2,118	£1,793	£1,543	£1,934	£1,940	£2,039	£2,611

	1502-6	1506-10	1510-13 (3 yrs)
Custumars	£2,326	£2,494	£2,094

APPENDIX B/5 (f) REMISSIONS OF GREAT CUSTOMS 1508-9 (ER, xiii, 225-238)

PORT	MERCHANDISE	GRANTEE	ALLOWANCE
Dumbarton and Lowis	24 Lasts Herring	John Collatt, Breton	£ 14- 8-0
"	3 Lasts Herring, 3 dacre Hides	Archibald, earl of Argyll	2- 4-0
KIRKCUDBRIGHT	Goods off Spanish Ship	George Mathieson	23- 6-8
Haddington	1 Last Hides, 15 doz Cloth	George Corntoun	4- 9-4
Edinburgh	3 Lasts, 6 sack , 6 stones Wool	Abbot of Melrose	48- 6-8
	2 Lasts, 1 Sack, 16 stones Wool, 5 lasts, Hides, 36 doz Cloth, 4 lasts Herring	Andrew Barton	46- 8-6
	3 Lasts, 4 sacks, 12 stones Wool, 1 Last Hides, 16 Lasts Salmon, 6C Herring, 13 Bar. Suet	Robert Barton	43-18-4
	2 Lasts, 7 Stacks 2 Stones Wool	Master John Murray	36- 2-3
	600 Doz Cloth, 3 lasts, 15 dacre Hides 4 Bars Suet	John Martin, John Hurcus Fernando Baptist, Martin of Spain	53- 0-0
	11 sacks, 6 stones of Wool	William Brownhill	15- 0-0
	17½ lasts Stokfish, 189 Doz. Cloth	Hans White	24-19-0
	47 Sacks Wool	Patrick Hume of Fastcastle	62-13-4
	5 Sacks, 14 stones Wool, 44 doz Cloth, 1 last, 7 dacre Hides	Lansleto Fery	13- 4-11
	1 Last, 2 dacre of Hides	Paul Galbraith	2-18- 8
	1 Last Hides	William Gascon	2-13-4
	2 Lasts Hides	King	6-13- 3
	3 Sacks, 16 stones Wool, 10 dacie hides	James Redheuch, comptroller	6- 4- 6
	2 Lasts Hides, 18 bars suet	John Framschoz	9-16- 8
	32 Doz. Cloth	Alan Cochran, Armourer	1-12- 0
	3 Sacks, 6 stones Wool, 7 lasts, 18 dacre Hides, 2 lasts Herring	Martin Leonait	26-12- 0
	1 Sack, 20 stones Wool, 44 doz Cloth, 400 Woolfells, 12 bars Flesh	John Hill	8-10- 3
	600 Woolfells, 12 dacre Hides	King	5-13- 8
	3 Lasts, 4 bars. Salmon	Archbishop of Glasgow	7- 0- 0
Moray etc.	8 Lasts Salmon	Patrick Leslie	19- 4- 0
Crail	9 Lasts, 3 Bars Herring	Alexander Burn	5-11- 0
Stirling	3 Sacks, 18 stones Wool, 16 dacre Hides 600 Woolfells	John Loutfut	8- 7- 4
	2 Sacks Wool, 275 Woolfells, 11 doz Cloth 4 Lasts, 5 dacre Hides	Alexander Forrester	17- 1- 5
	1 Last Hides	King	2-13- 4
Aberdeen	10 Lasts, 8 Bars Salmon	George, Lord St.John	25-12- 0
		TOTAL	£594- 4- 5

APPENDIX B/5 (f) REMISSIONS OF GREAT CUSTOMS 1508-9 (ER, xiii, 225-238)

PORT	MERCHANDISE	GRANTEE	ALLOWANCE
Dumbarton and Lowis	24 Lasts Herring	John Collatt, Breton	£ 14- 8-0
"	3 Lasts Herring, 3 dacre Hides	Archibald, earl of Argyll	2- 4-0
KIRKCUDBRIGHT	Goods off Spanish Ship	George Mathieson	23- 6-8
Haddington	1 Last Hides, 15 doz Cloth	George Corntoun	4- 9-4
Edinburgh	3 Lasts, 6 sack , 6 stones Wool	Abbot of Melrose	48- 6-8
	2 Lasts, 1 Sack, 16 stones Wool, 5 lasts, Hides, 36 doz Cloth, 4 lasts Herring	Andrew Barton	46- 8-6
	3 Lasts, 4 sacks, 12 stones Wool, 1 Last Hides, 16 Lasts Salmon, 6C Herring, 13 Bar. Suet	Robert Barton	43-18-4
	2 Lasts, 7 Stacks 2 Stones Wool	Master John Murray	36- 2-3
	600 Doz Cloth, 3 lasts, 15 dacre Hides 4 Bars Suet	John Martin, John Hurcus Fernando Baptist, Martin of Spain	53- 0-0
	11 sacks, 6 stones of Wool	William Brownhill	15- 0-0
	17½ lasts Stokfish, 189 Doz. Cloth	Hans White	24-19-0
	47 Sacks Wool	Patrick Hume of Fastcastle	62-13-4
	5 Sacks, 14 stones Wool, 44 doz Cloth, 1 last, 7 dacre Hides	Lansleto Fery	13- 4-11
	1 Last, 2 dacre of Hides	Paul Galbraith	2-18- 8
	1 Last Hides	William Gascon	2-13-4
	2 Lasts Hides	King	6-13- 3
	3 Sacks, 16 stones Wool, 10 dacie hides	James Redheuch, comptroller	6- 4- 6
	2 Lasts Hides, 18 bars suet	John Framschoz	9-16- 8
	32 Doz. Cloth	Alan Cochran, Armourer	1-12- 0
	3 Sacks, 6 stones Wool, 7 lasts, 18 dacre Hides, 2 lasts Herring	Martin Leonait	26-12- 0
	1 Sack, 20 stones Wool, 44 doz Cloth, 400 Woolfells, 12 bars Flesh	John Hill	8-10- 3
	600 Woolfells, 12 dacre Hides	King	5-13- 8
	3 Lasts, 4 bars. Salmon	Archbishop of Glasgow	7- 0- 0
Moray etc.	8 Lasts Salmon	Patrick Leslie	19- 4- 0
Crail	9 Lasts, 3 Bars Herring	Alexander Burn	5-11- 0
Stirling	3 Sacks, 18 stones Wool, 16 dacre Hides 600 Woolfells	John Loutfut	8- 7- 4
	2 Sacks Wool, 275 Woolfells, 11 doz Cloth 4 Lasts, 5 dacre Hides	Alexander Forrester	17- 1- 5
	1 Last Hides	King	2-13- 4
Aberdeen	10 Lasts, 8 Bars Salmon	George, Lord St.John	25-12- 0
		TOTAL	£594- 4- 5

APPENDIX B/5(g) THE EFFECT OF THE ROYAL REVOCATION OF 1424 ON PENSIONS, FEES AND ANNUITIES ATTACHED TO THE GREAT CUSTOMS
(ER, iv, 337-348, 379-390)

BURGH	PENSIONER	TYPE	FIXED RATE OF PENSION	1420-1	1424-5
Stirling	Chaplain of St.Lawrence	A	£ 1- 0- 0	£ 1- 0- 0	£ 1- 0- 0
Inverkeithing	Convent of Culross	R	12 Sacks of Wool	32- 0- 0	-
Dundee	Dominicans of Perth	A	7- 6- 8	7- 6- 8	7- 6- 8
	Prior of Restenneth	A	13- 6- 8	13- 6- 8	13- 6- 8
	Sir Andrew Tweedale for soul of David, Duke of Rothesay		5- 0- 0	5- 0- 0	5- 0 -0 Verbal Grant
	Alex. earl of Crawford	H	66-13- 4	66-13- 4	66-13- 4
	Alex. Ogilvy of Auchterhouse	H	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	-
	Lady Agnes Tulloch	Life gift of Robert III	6-13- 4	6-13- 4	-
	John Scrimgeour, 'mercer'	L	10- 0- 0	10- 0- 0	10- 0- 0
	Lady Egidee Stewart	Assignation of duke Murdoch	13- 6- 8	13- 6- 8	-
	Late Sir Robert Maxwell	L	20- 0- 0	10- 0- 0 (1 term)	DEAD
Edinburgh	Abbot of Melrose	R	50 sacks of Wool	66-13- 4	66-13- 4
	Sir James Douglas of Dalkeith	H	40- 0- 0	40- 0- 0	8-2- 3 Royal Gift 1 year only
	Lady Margaret Forrester	H	10- 0- 0	10- 0- 0	-
	Chaplain in the Castle	A	8- 0- 0	8- 0- 0	8- 0- 0
	Abbot of Holyrood	L	26-13- 4	26-13- 4	-
	William Gifford, royal servant		20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0
	Marjory Lindsay, widow of Sir Henry Douglas		33- 6- 8	33- 6- 8	-
Linlithgow	John Stewart of Dundonald	H	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	-
	Alex. Livingstone of Calender	H	20- 0- 0	13- 6- 8	-
	terce to Agnes Livingstone			5-15-10	-
	Thomas Park	H	10- 0- 0	4- 8-10	-
	Mary Park, mother of Thomas	terce		2- 4- 5	-
late	Mary, duchess of Rothesay	L	100- 0- 0	50- 0- 0 (1 term)	DEAD
Montrose	David Lindsay of Kinneff	H	26-13- 4	26-13- 4	-
	Lady Egidee Stewart	Assy.of Governor	6-13- 4	6-13- 4	-

BURGH	PENSIONER	TYPE	FIXED RATE OF PENSION	1420-1	1424-5
Perth	Dominicans of Perth	A	£ 7- 6-8	£ 7- 6- 8	£ 7- 6- 8
	Prior of St.Andrews	A	2- 0- 0	2- 0- 0	2- 0- 0
	Michael Menar	H	13- 6- 8	13- 6- 8	-
	John Stewart of Dundonald	H	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	-
	Late John Crawford, royal clerk	R	8 sacks of Wool	10-13- 4	DEAD
Aberdeen	Murdoch duke of Albany	H	100 marks	41- 8-11	Transferred to Account
	Alex. earl of Crawford	H	100 marks	NIL	-
	Gilbert, Bishop of Aberdeen	L	26-13- 4	20- 0- 0	DEAD 1421
Haddington	William Cockburn	H	20- 0- 0	20- 0- 0	-
Total Financial Effect on Custumars' Accounts				£653-18- 0	£215- 8-11

APPENDIX B/5(h) ACCOUNT OF CUSTUMARS OF EDINBURGH, 1417-8. MEMORANDUM LISTING A SERIES OF EXPORTED GOODS FROM THE PORT OF LEITH WHICH THE CUSTUMARS UNDER OATH, MAINTAINED SUBMITTED NO CUSTOMS. (ER, iv, 300-1)

	WOOL	PELTS	HIDES
William Blane, burgess of Edinburgh	2 serplathe 1 Pack		
John Skinner	2 serplathe		
Thomas of Berwick	9 "	1 Pack	
Andrew of Kelso	1 "		
Patrick Langhope	2 "		
William Torribus	2 "		
David Torribus	0 "	2 Packs	
Gilbert Swift	2 "		
Gilbert Swift and James Douglas	4 "		1 serplathe 1 'pynnoh'
Robert Niddry	26 "	1 Pack	
James Dundas	22 "		
Robert Borthwick	9 "		1 "
Robert Pringle	8 "		
John Seaton			2 "
John Livingstone	1 "		1 "
John Watson Duncanson	1 "	1 Pack	
Alexander Napier	2 "	1 "	
Adam Bonkle	2 "		
Gilbert Swift	4 "		
George Pacton	2 "		
Thmoas Hall	2 "		
Gynnis of Linlithgow	16 Sacks	(Exported secretly and breadking arrest)	
James Douglas	17 " 7 Stone	100 Pelts	3 Dacre
John Vernour			7 "
	103 serplathe 7 Packs 33 Sacks, 7 stone	5 serplathe 1 'pynnoh' 100 Pelts	10 Dacre

APPENDIX B/5(i) ENTRIES OF SHIPS AT LEITH, 17 December 1510 to 4 January 1510-1. (SRO Customs Books No.29/2)

Introitus Johannis Walgraif versus London Decimo Septimo Decembris.

Elgin K (Oketa)	George Diksoun	vii Last Salmond
Elgin K	My Lord of Caitmes	viii " "
Dunfermlyn K	Henry Scott et Robert Bell	vi Chalder Salt
Haddington K	Adam Maw	viii Stekis Inglis Carsay
Rex.	Andro Bertoun	vii Stekis

Introitus Gillyeame de Buris iiii^to Die Mensis Januarii Versus Deip.

	Richart Alane franchman	ii½ Last Hidis, ii b, Hering, i^c Keling
	Johne Irland	viii ½ Daker Cor
	William Inglis	ix " "
	William Forsith	ii Polkis Lane
	Andro Watsoun	iii Daker Cor
	Thom Otterburne	v½ " "
	Andro Ross	viii½ " "
	George Halkerstoun	iii Polkis Lane, vii b Tallon, i Bed Panni
	George Diksoun	iiii Polkis Lane
	Philp Forester	i Bed Panni, i Fardell Pellium Lamskynnis
	Robert Lyne	i Polk Lane
	David Mailvile	xxxiiii b. Hering
	Robert Bartoun	vii½ Dakir v b. Talloun
	Idem	iii^c Calf Skynnis
Pittenweme K	Alane Wilsoun	xii b. Hering
" "	James Balfoure	xx b Hering

THE WOWE

Item.	Jhon Getgud	i secc and xx Stan
"	Idem A Pok	xxiiii Stan
"	Robyn Norre	A Pok xvl Stan
"	Mychel Dorrence	A Pok xviii Stan
"	Jhon of Glen	A Pok xviii Stan
"	Maister Hew of Grenlaw	A Pok xx Stan
"	Idem A Pok	xvi Stan
"	Edvard Spens	A Pok xxvi Stan
"	Idem A Pok	xxiiii Stan
"	David Pourhous	A sacc and xx Stan
"	Idem a Sacc	And xviii Stan
"	Jhon Getgud	A sacc and xx Stan
"	Idem a sacc	And xviii Stan
"	Codbert Dekyson	A sacc and xviii Stan
"	Thomas Anderson	A sacc and xx Stan.

APPENDIX B/6(a) LANDS HELD IN WARD OR NON ENTRY, ACCOUNTED FOR BY APPOINTED 'BALLIVI AD EXTRA'

DATE OF ACCOUNT	No.OF YEARS	LAND	ACCOUNTANT	GROSS CHARGE	REAL REVENUE	TYPE
1438	2	Colliery of Tranent	John Hog (Provost)	£722- 7- 1	£146- 7- 6	Ward
1438	1½	Duchal	Sir Thos. Boyd of Kilmarnock (baillie and farmer)	124- 0- 0	60- 0- 0	Ward
1441	1	Barony of Glenbervie and Cammay	Patrick Barclay (baillie)	40- 3- 2	-	Ward
1441	1½	Baronies of Errol and Capet	William Hay	800- 0- 0	388-13- 4	Ward
1445	2½	Barony of Panmure	Alex. Ogilvy of Innerquhony	205-13- 4	64- 6- 5	Ward
1462	1½	Blackwood	Oswald Weir	28-10- 0	5-14- 9	Ward
1463	1	Errol	Thos. Wadsper of Gonys	268- 7- 0 and kind	168- 3- 0	Ward
1509	1	Barony of Balmain	Thos. lord Innermeath	100-13- 4	60-16- 0	Apprized for repayment of non-entry.
1510	1½	Earldom of Sutherland	Andrew, Bishop of Caithness	366- 7- 0 and kind	-	Non entry through idiot:
1512	1	Ibid	Ibid	250-18-0	21 chalders of barley	of earl

ACCOUNT	No.OF YEARS	LAND	ACCOUNTANT	GROSS CHARGE	REAL REVENUE	ARREARS
1506	½	Hayburton	Richard Nicholson	£203-18- 3	£ 60- 0- 0	£137- 0- 0
1507	1	"	"	381-16- 5	108-18- 3	256- 3-10
1508	1	"	"	381-16- 5	70- 8- 0	452-19-11
1509	1	"	"	381-16- 5	57- 0- 0	414- 9- 8
1510	1	"	"	381-16- 5	40-17- 4	510- 9- 1
1512	1	"	"	381-16- 5	20- 0- 0	715- 8- 7
1513	1	"	"	381-16- 5	29- 0- 0	823- 5- 0

ACCOUNT	NO.OF YEARS	LAND	ACCOUNTANT	GROSS CHARGE	COMMUNTED RENTS IN KIND	TO COMPTROLLER	ARREARS
1506	1	Auchterhouse, Eassie, Nevay	William, Master of Ruthven	£234- 6- 8	£137- 6-.6	£175- 0- 2	£ 49-13- 2
1507	1	"	"	234- 6- 8	35- 9- 6	161-13- 4	13- 6- 8
1508	1	"	"	242- 6- 8	67- 0- 0	177- 8-11	-
1509	1	"	"	242- 6- 8	38-13- 4	132-15- 6	-
1510	1	"	"	242- 6- 8	28-10- 0	101-11- 8	-
1512	2	"	"	484-13- 4	9- 6- 8	100- 8-11	-
1513	1	"	"	242- 6- 8	9- 6- 8	9- 6- 8	109- 0- 9

APPENDIX B/6(b) 'Redditus assise' and Blanchfarm tenure, Revenue Returns in the Sheriff's Rolls.

1455 Account of the Sheriff of Peebles. ER, vi, 86.

6/8 Sale of 1 pair of gilt spurs 'redditus assise' of the land of Wylysland in the tenement of Bondyngtoun, for the term of Whitsun in this account, 'auia tunc redditur tantum'.

1 lb. of Pepper or 3/- 'redditus assise' of the land of Romanoss.

8d Sale of 1 lb of cumin of the 'redditus assise' of the land of Kingsland.

1d Blanchfarm of the land of Brigland.

1d. Blanchfarm of the land of Kirkurd.

1d Blanchfarm of the land of Jedburghfield.

1d Blanchfarm of the land of Acomfield.

1d Blanchfarm of the land of Waitertayl.

1d Blanchfarm of the land of Menner.

8d Sale of 1 lb. cumin 'redditus assise' of one hostilage at the east end of the burgh of Peebles.

TOTAL £0-11-6d.

1501 Account of the Sheriff of Drumfries. ER, xi, 312.

6/8 Sale of 1 pair of gilt spurs blanchfarm of the land of Carnesallauch.

6/8 Ibid. Glenkeirne.

6/8 Ibid. Shaid.

1d Blanchfarm of the land of Keldwod.

6/8 Sale of 1 pair of gilt spurs blanchfarm of the land of Crage.

3/- Blanchfarm of the land of Lag.

1 Greyhound blanchfarm of the land of Brakenewraa.

4d Blanchfarm of the land of Kirkpatrick.

1d Blanchfarm of the land of Kirkmichael.

TOTAL £1-10- 2 and a Greyhound.

APPENDIX B/6(c) DETAILS OF SHERIFFS ACCOUNTS DURING FIFTEENTH AND EARLY SIXTEENTH CENTURY

ER, xi 83-109, 140-189. viii 2-41. SRO. Uprinted Account xi 301-82

ACCOUNT	NON ENTRY & WARDS	BLANCHFERME & 'REDDITUS ASSISE'	RELIEF	SHERIFFS COURT	CROWN LAND	JUSTICE AYRE	CHAMBERLAIN AYRE	CASTLEWARD	ESCHEATE	NO. OF RETURNS
1455	£ 248- 4-2	£ 21-10- 2	£ 215- 0- 0	£ 17-18- 4	£212-13- 4	£ 123- 0- 0	£169-11- 0	£ 94-16- 8	£ 16-10- 0	13
1456	753-18-0	47- 7-10	366- 6- 4	60- 2- 8	214-16- 8	248- 0- 0	44- 4-10	185-19- 4	38-18- 8	22
1471	179-11-8	57-10-10	447-13- 4	108-19- 8	308- 5- 7	305-13- 4	134- 0- 0	144-15- 0	7- 7- 8	27
1489	696- 1-0	32- 8- 4	499-13- 8	-	261-13- 4	1,059-10- 0	-	120-15- 8	63- 0- 0	12
1501	7,999-10-7	105-17- 4	1,457-12- 3	121- 6- 0	693- 9- 4	8,892-13- 4	-	449-17- 0	257- 4- 7	30

	GROSS CHARGE	ARREARS	OVERALL TOTAL CHARGE	ALLOWANCES	COMPTROLLER	TREASURER	BALANCE
1455	£ 1,127-12- 4	£ 1,283- 3-10	£ 2,410-16- 2	£ 703- 8- 5	£126- 5- 4	£ -	£ 1,581- 2- 5
1456	2,008-16- 7	1,997- 8- 2	4,006- 4- 9	1,655- 8- 6	155- 1- 0	-	2,195-15- 3
1471	1,728-15- 4	1,634-16-11	3,363-12- 3	1,507-10- 8	590-16- 2	373- 7- 4	891-18- 1
1489	2,812-12- 3	2,248-19- 0	5,061-11- 3	1,917-15- 3	147- 1-10	69- 6- 1	2,927- 8- 1
1501	23,364- 7- 3	26,664-15-10	50,029- 3- 1	26,775-13- 0	281-15- 4	2,245-16- 2	20,725-18- 7

APPENDIX B/6(d)

DETAILED FIGURES OF SHERIFFS' ACCOUNTS 1501. A BREAKDOWN OF THE ENTRIES ON THE CHARGE SIDE OF EACH ACCOUNT AND AN ANALYSIS OF EACH ACCOUNT. (ER, xi, 301 - 382)

	CASTLEWARDS	BLANCHFERME AND 'REDDITUS ASSISE'	EXCHEQUER FINE	WARD AND NON ENTRY	RELIEF	SHERIFF COURT ISSUES	ESCHEATE	CROWN LAND	JUSTICE AYRE	EXTRA
Edinburgh (Middleward)	£ 21--4- 8	£ 1- 4- 7								
Perth (inside the burgh)										£ 16- 1- 4 Custom of wild horses at the Fair
Clackmannan			£10- 0- 0	£ 8- 0- 0				£ 0- 6- 0		
Strathearn (Stewardry)		0- 0- 6		41- 3- 4	£ 10- 0- 0	£ 20- 0- 0				
Cunningham (Baillery)		0- 0- 4		1-13- 4	3- 6- 8	2-14- 0				
Peebles		0- 8- 7	10- 0- 0	295- 6- 8			£ 4- 1- 3			£ 30- 0- 0 Indenture
Argyll and Cowal		0- 1- 0		2-13- 4						
Dumfries		10-10- 4		266-13- 4		7- 7- 0		66-13- 4		66-13- 4 Indenture
Inverness				433- 6- 8	401- 6- 8	20- 0- 0			£ 696-13- 4	
Kinross		0-14- 6	10- 0- 0				3- 0- 0			
Aberdeen		1-15-10				4-19- 0	10- 5- 4			
Selkirk		1- 1- 4							96- 6- 8	
Roxburgh	119- 0- 0	16- 3- 9	10- 0- 0	1,093-10-10	73-13- 4	2-14- 0	1-16- 0		4,470-13- 4	
Forfar		4-15- 8		208-13- 4	64-13- 4		33- 6- 8			
Forres and Elgin		8- 0- 0		3- 5- 0	20- 0- 0	8- 0- 0				10- 0- 0 Double Feu Entry
Carrick (bailliery)		0- 1- 0	10- 0- 0		30- 0- 0					
Wigtown					179-16- 8	2-14- 0	0-13- 4			
Annandale (Stewardry)				12- 0- 0	4- 0- 0			40- 3- 4		1- 8- 0 Burgh Ferme of Lochmaben
Dumbarton		0- 1- 8		621-13- 4		9- 0- 0	8- 7- 4	434- 6- 8	257- 0- 0	
Ayr		0- 0- 5	10- 0- 0	866-13- 4	151- 0- 0	2-14- 0	2- 0- 0	120- 0- 0		
Lanark	126- 0- 0	8- 4- 0		3,180-10- 8		10-16- 0	102- 6- 8		1,748- 6- 8	10- 0- 0 Indenture
Menteith (Stewardry)				0- 8- 0	17- 0- 0					20- 0- 0 Double Feu Entry
Fife		4- 0- 8		185- 6- 9	20- 8-11	8- 0- 0	40- 0- 0			
Kincardine		1- 5- 6		15- 0- 0	19-13- 4	4- 0- 0	2-11- 4	32- 0- 0		
Perth				241- 0- 0	187- 6- 8	4- 0- 0				
Renfrew						2-14- 0	4-10- 0		1,081- 0- 0	
Berwick	67- 7- 0	45- 2- 1		118-13- 4		2-14- 0				3,280- 0- 0 through Indentures
Banff		6- 0- 0		320- 8- 8	106- 0- 0		31- 0- 0		542-13- 4	2- 0- 0 " "
Edinburgh (Constabulary of Haddington)	116- 5- 4	4-19- 0		0- 4- 0		3-12- 0	13- 6- 8			
Kirkcudbright (Stewardry)		0- 6- 8	10- 0- 0	83- 6- 8	166-13- 4	2-14- 0				
TOTALS	£449-17- 0	£105-17- 4	£70- 0- 0	£7,999-10- 7	£1,457-12- 3	£121- 6- 0	£257- 4- 7	£693- 9- 4	£8,892-13- 4	

APPENDIX D/6(d) DETAILED FIGURES OF SHERIFFS' ACCOUNTS 1501. A BREAKDOWN OF THE ENTRIES ON THE CHARGE SIDE OF EACH ACCOUNT AND AN ANALYSIS OF EACH ACCOUNT (ER, xi, 301x-382x)

No.of Years	CHARGE	ARREARS	OVERALL TOTAL CHARGE	ALLOWANCES	COMPTROLLER	TREASURER	BALANCE
½	£ 22- 9- 3	453-10- 3	475-19- 6	52- 6- 8	3-12- 0	-	£ 419- 0-10
4	16- 1- 4	-	16- 1- 4	16- 1- 4	-	-	-
2	18- 6- 0	4- 0- 0	22- 6- 0	12- 0- 0	4- 6- 0	6- 0- 0	-
3	71- 3- 4	190-18- 1	262- 1- 5	42-15- 0	0- 1- 3	59- 6- 1	160- 0- 0
1	7-14- 4	-	7-14- 4	-	0- 0- 4	7-14- 0	-
1	342-10- 6	17- 7-10	359-18- 4	299-11- 5	4- 8- 7	47- 9- 9	165- 0- 0
1½	5- 7- 8	489-10- 0	494-17- 8	102-13- 4	-	-	392- 4- 4
1	408-14- 2	5,124- 3- 1	5,532-17- 2	4,624-13- 8	81- 3- 6	-	1,827- 0- 0
7	1,551- 6- 8	-	1,551- 6- 8	360- 6- 8	-	-	1,191- 0- 0
2	13-14- 4	30- 0- 0	43-14- 4	10-14- 4	3- 0- 0	30- 0- 0	-
1	16-14- 9	729-12- 6	746- 7- 3	172-12-11	1-15- 9	87- 4- 4	484-14- 3
2	97- 8- 0	195- 0- 0	292- 8- 0	72- 0- 0	-	40- 0- 0	180- 8- 0
3	5,787-11-3	1,096- 4- 6	6,883-15- 9	2,729-13- 4	-	186- 0-10	3,968- 1- 7
1½	311- 9- 0	106-17- 0	418- 6- 0	166-13- 4	-	66- 4- 8	185- 8- 0
2	39-15- 0	214- 0- 0	253-15- 0	130- 0- 0	-	40- 0- 0	83-15- 0
½	40- 1- 0	-	40- 1- 0	36-13- 4	0- 1- 0	3- 6- 8	-
½	183- 4- 0	372-10- 0	555-14- 0	130- 0- 0	-	66-13- 4	359- 0- 8
1	57-11- 4	2,214- 8- 0	2,271-19- 4	30- 0- 0	-	-	2,241-19- 4
5	1,329- 9- 2	8,960- 0- 0	10,289- 9- 0	9,624-14- 0	-	90- 0- 0	574-15- 0
1	1,152- 7- 7	1,175-12- 3	2,328- 0- 0	1,285- 0- 0	100- 0- 0	476- 4- 8	466-15- 4
4	5,127-10- 8	1,130-12- 6	6,258- 3- 2	3,829- 6- 8	-	145- 0- 0	2,283-16- 6
3	37- 8- 0	55- 0- 0	92- 8- 0	23- 8- 2	30- 0- 0	38-19-10	-
1	257-16- 4	993-17- 8	1,251-14- 0	954- 8-3	4- 1- 5	293- 4- 4	-
1½	74-10- 2	574-16- 8	649- 6-10	41- 4- 8	33- 5- 6	34-16- 8	540- 0- 0
½	432- 6- 8	270- 0- 5	702- 7- 1	511- 4- 9	-	191- 2- 4	-
½	1,038- 4- 0	209- 7- 5	1,252-11- 5	330- 3- 4	5- 0- 0	196- 2- 0	721- 6- 1

APPENDIX B/6(d) contd.

No.of Years	CHARGE	ARREARS	OVERALL TOTAL CHARGE	ALLOWANCES	COMPTROLLER	TREASURER	BALANCE
3	£ 3,513-16- 5	£ 766-18- 8	4,280-15- 2	727- 7- 4	-	-	3,553- 7- 9
6	1,008- 8- 8	239- 5-11	1,247-14- 7	602-16- 1	6- 0- 0	117- 0- 0	521-18- 6
4	138- 7- 0	461-14- 5	600- 1- 4	273- 6- 7	-	13- 6- 8	313- 8- 1
½	263- 0- 8	589- 8- 8	852- 9- 4	754-10- 0	5- 0- 0	-	92-19- 4
-	-	1,963- 8-11	1,963- 8-11	1,836-11- 1	-	110- 0- 0	16-17-10
TOTALS	£23,364- 7- 3	£26,664-15-10	£50,029- 3- 1	£26,775-13- 0	£281-15- 4	£2,245-16- 2	£20,725-18- 7

£2,527-11-6

APPENDIX B/6(e) GROSS CASUALTY CHARGE TO SHERIFFS, 1501 ACCOUNT AND ALLOWANCES SET AGAINST THEM. (ER, xi, 301 - 82)

SHERIFFDOM	CHARGE	ALLOWANCES
Edinburgh	-	-
Clackmannan	8- 0- 0	6- 0- 0
Strathearn	51- 3- 4	40- 0- 0
Cunningham	5- 0- 0	-
Peebles	295- 6- 8	272- 0- 0
Argyll and Cowal	5- 6- 8	-
Dumfries	266-13- 4	266-13- 4
Inverness	834-1-3 4	-
Kinross	-	-
Aberdeen	-	-
Selkirk	-	-
Roxburgh	1,167- 3- 2	733-13- 4
Forfar	273- 6- 8	166-13- 4
Forres and Elgin	23- 5- 0	-
Carrick	30- 0- 0	26-13- 4
Wigtown	179-16- 8	120- 0- 0
Annandale	16- 0- 0	-
Dumbarton	621-13- 4	621-13- 4
Ayr	1,017-13- 4	1,017-13- 4
Lanark	3,121-17- 4	3,106- 0- 0
Menteith	17- 8- 0	-
Fife	205-15- 8	7- 6- 9
Kincardine	34-13- 4	14-13- 4
Perth	428- 6- 8	377- 6- 8
Renfrew	-	-
Berwick	118-13- 4	93- 6- 8
Banff	426- 8- 8	62- 6- 8
Haddington	0- 4- 0	-
Kirkcudbright	250- 0- 0	250- 0- 0
TOTAL	£9,398- 8- 6	£7,182- 0- 1

APPENDIX B/6 (f) RENTS FROM CROWN PROPERTY ACCOUNTED IN SHERIFFS' ROLLS

(ER, vi, 140-189, viii, 2-41, xi, 301 - 82)

1456

Dumbarton, Rosneath		36-13- 4	
	Cardross	26-13- 4	
	Annual rent ot Cadzow	26-13- 4	
	Cumbrae	33- 6- 8	3 chalders, 2B barley, 10 marts
	Finnart	13- 6- 8	
Lanark	Stanehouse	0-10- 0	
Renfrew	Finnart	10- 0- 0	
Kinross	Demesne of Burle and Tulery	29- 6- 8	
	Schanell	4-13- 4	
	Hilton	4-13- 4	
	Mill of Quhorth	6- 0- 0	
Ayr	Annual rent of Traboch	6-13- 4	
	Dallyngeig and Leffynrewack	8- 0- 0	
	Scheffelde	3- 6- 8	

TOTAL FARM 1456 £209-16- 8

1501

Dumbarton	Cardross	26-13- 4	
	Annual rent of Cadzow	26-13- 4	
	Cumbrae	33- 6- 8	3 chalders, 2 bolls barley,10 marts
	Pension from Paisley Abbey		5 chalders of Meal
Kincardine	Feu of Kinneff	16- 0- 0	
Clackmannan	Feu of Hilton, Edwardhill	0- 6- 0	
	1 croft of Gilber Brady		
Dumfries	Drumcoll	66-13- 4	
Annandale	Lochmaben	10- 0- 0	
	Metach and Smallholme	10- 0- 0	
	Fishing of Annand	10- 0- 0	
	Feryland	6-13- 4	
	Coklaikis and Pimillis	0- 6- 8	
	Foggage of Wodcokair	2- 0- 0	
	32 Parishes inside Annandale		32 marts
	Brigholme	0-10- 0	

Annandale	Balye Akir	0- 3- 4
	Prikkatt Akir	0- 3- 4
	Northfield	0- 6- 8
Ayr	Trabock and Terrenzerne	120- 0- 0
TOTAL FARM	1501	£329-16- 0

APPENDIX B/7(a) CHAMBERLAINS' RECEIPTS 1405-6 to 1435

	1405-6 to 1406-7	1406-7 to 1407-8	1407-8 to 1409	1409-10	1410-12
Customers	£1,304-13- 6	£1,485- 3- 3	£1,930-17- 3	£2,360- 6-10	£5,573- 6- 3
Burgh Bailies	8-19- 2	23- 4- 4	15- 2- 8	16- 0- 8	33-14-11
Sheriffs	19- 0- 0	89- 9- 3	35-11- 4	110- 6-11	38-11- 4
Chamberlain Ayre	52- 0- 0	37- 2- 8	38-15- 4	12-13- 4	56- 0- 0
Crown Land	13- 6- 8	6-13- 4	6-13- 4	6-13- 4	
Vacant See	53- 6- 8	51- 6- 8	232-11- 8		
Feudal Casualty	-	240- 0- 0			
TOTAL	£1,451- 6- 0	£1,931-19- 6	£2,259-11- 7	£2,506- 1- 1	£5,701-12- 6

	1412-3	1413-4	1414-5	1415-6	1416-7
Customers	£2,306- 3-11	£1,639-13- 2	£1,375- 2- 3	£2,405-17- 0	£1,480- 6- 8
Burgh Baillies	21- 8- 8	10- 9- 8	13- 6- 0	15- 6- 0	12- 2- 8
Sheriffs	31- 6- 8	169-12- 1	191-12- 3	56- 3- 0	280- 3- 0
Chamberlain Ayre	33-14- 8	36-13- 4	31- 0- 0	64- 0- 0	67-16- 8
Crown Land	-	-	-	-	-
Vacant See	-	-	-	-	-
Feudal Casualty	-	-	-	-	133- 6- 8
TOTAL	£2,392-13-11	£1,856- 8- 3	£1,611- 0- 6	£2,541- 6- 0	£1,973-15- 8

	1417-8	1418-20	1420-21	1421-2
Custumers	1,082-18- 0	1,885-16- 7	1,164- 5- 8	1,014-19-11
Burgh Baillies	13- 6- 0	26-10- 8	8-12- 0	16- 3- 8
Sheriffs	26- 0- 0	389- 0- 4	1,225- 8- 3	185-10- 5
Chamberlain Ayre	7-13- 4	7-13- 4	151- 6- 8	75- 0- 0
Crown Land	-	-	-	-
Vacant See	-	-	-	-
Feudal Casualty	-	-	-	-
	£1,129-17- 4	£2,309- 0-11	£2,549-12- 7	£1,291-14- 0

	1425-6	1434-5
Custumers	£145- 1- 0	-
Burgh Baillies	68- 8- 0	-
Sheriffs	21- 7- 5	-
Chamberlain Ayre	244- 0- 0	380-13- 4
Crown Land	10- 8- 0	-
Vacant See	-	-
Feudal Casualty	-	-
Forstalling Fines	41-13-10	342- 9- 0
Fine for Wrong Judgement	-	25-12- 0
	£530-18- 3	£748-14- 4

APPENDIX B/7(b) DETAILS OF BALANCES OF ACCOUNT OF CHAMBERLAIN AND DEPUTY

	Account of Earl of Crawford	Account of Sir John Forrester				
	1405-6 to 1406-7	1406-7 to 1407-8	1407-8 to 1409	1409-10	1410-2	
Dep. Chamberlain	-	£142-5-1	£48-11-7	£63- 7- 8	62-11- 6	29- 2- 9
Chamberlain	£10-19-2		12-15-0	-	-	276- 3- 9
Duke of Albany			-	-	-	-

	1412-3	1413-4	1414-5
Dep. Chamberlain	£ 63- 6- 4	42- 6- 0	64- 3- 3
Chamberlain	117-10-11	186-18- 4	307-17- 0
Duke of Albany	553-10- 0	947- 7- 5	1,284- 0- 7

	1415-6	1416-7	1417-8	1418-20	1420-1
Dep. Chamberlain	£ 83- 5- 1	£ 120-17-11	£ 149- 3- 6	£ 172- 2- 4	£ 165-17- 1
Chamberlain	1,108-11- 1	2,029- 0- 5	2,771- 8- 5	4,397- 0- 7	337-13- 2
Duke of Albany					3,152-15- 8

	1421-2
Dep.Chamberlain	£ 130-18- 1
Chamberlain	451- 6- 6
Duke of Albany	3,809-15- 8

APPENDIX B/7(c) FEES AND PENSIONS PAYABLE FROM CHAMBERLAINS ACCOUNT OF 1416

(ER iv, 261-6)

(L = Life H = Hereditary)

John Steward of Railston (Dead)	L	@ £20	(Pension now expired as John had died)
Jams Wedale	L	£10	
Lion Herald	Fee	£ 3-6-8	
Alexander, Earl of Mar		£133-6-8	(This the right of his wife Isabelle)
William Fullarton	H	£13-6-8	
Thomas Steward of Kelly	H	£13-6-8	
David Steward of Hartshaw	H	£13-6-8	
Robert, Duke of Albany	H	£136-0-0	For lands of Abthania of Dull
		£133-6-8	Fee as Keeper of Stirling Castle
	H	£133-6-8	From customs of Linlithgow and Cupar
		£1,000-0-0	Fee as Governor
John, Earl of Buchan		£200-0-0	Fee as Chamberlain
Total of Annual Pesions and Fees		£1,809-6-8	

APPENDIX B/8(a) RECEIPTS FROM GREAT CUSTOMS AND BURGH FERMS TO CROWN 'RECEIVERS' 1425-35. (ER iv, 400-638)

	1426	1428	1429	1430	1431	1434	1435	TOTAL
Comptroller	£2,067- 0- 4	£ 802-19- 0	£ 814- 6- 5	£ 796- 0- 9	£ 172-19-10	£2,220- 6- 8	£949- 9- 0	£7,823- 2- 0
Treasurer	732-10- 9	7- 3- 4	-	-	-	-	-	£ 739-14- 1
Master John Winchester	18-18- 7	1,166- 3- 5	48- 5- 0	587-16- 4	-	201- 4- 9	249-13- 9	£2,272- 1-10
Master Thomas Mireton	-	474- 5- 2	556-11- 5	28- 5- 4	2,291-17-11	-	-	£3,350-19-10
Clerk of Saces	-	261- 7- 0	300- 3- 8	411- 3-10	41- 2-10	-	23- 8- 8	£1,037- 6- 0
Custodian of Privy Seal	389- 7- 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	£ 389- 7- 7
Chamberlain	187- 9- 0	23- 2- 0	8- 1- 4	-	-	-	-	£ 218-12- 4
To King, 'in copras regis'	80 -0- 0	-	200- 0- 0	-	110- 7- 9	366- 6-10	340-10- 1	£1,097- 4- 8
Robert Gray, Master of Royal Mint	-	190- 0- 0	712- 4- 5	1,018- 0- 3	566-14- 6	20- 0- 0	600-10- 4	£3,107- 9- 6

APPENDIX B/8(a) RECEIPTS FROM GREAT CUSTOMS AND BURGH FERMS TO CROWN 'RECEIVERS' 1425-35. (ER iv, 400-638)

	1426	1428	1429	1430	1431	1434	1435	TOTAL
Comptroller	£2,067- 0- 4	£ 802-19- 0	£ 814- 6- 5	£ 796- 0- 9	£ 172-19-10	£2,220- 6- 8	£949- 9- 0	£7,823- 2- 0
Treasurer	732-10- 9	7- 3- 4	-	-	-	-	-	£ 739-14- 1
Master John Winchester	18-18- 7	1,166- 3- 5	48- 5- 0	587-16- 4	-	201- 4- 9	249-13- 9	£2,272- 1-10
Master Thomas Mireton	-	474- 5- 2	556-11- 5	28- 5- 4	2,291-17-11	-	-	£3,350-19-10
Clerk of Saces	-	261- 7- 0	300- 3- 8	411- 3-10	41- 2-10	-	23- 8- 8	£1,037- 6- 0
Custodian of Privy Seal	389- 7- 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	£ 389- 7- 7
Chamberlain	187- 9- 0	23- 2- 0	8- 1- 4	-	-	-	-	£ 218-12- 4
To King, 'in copras regis'	80 -0- 0	-	200- 0- 0	-	110- 7- 9	366- 6-10	340-10- 1	£1,097- 4- 8
Robert Gray, Master of Royal Mint	-	190- 0- 0	712- 4- 5	1,018- 0- 3	566-14- 6	20- 0- 0	600-10- 4	£3,107- 9- 6

APPENDIX B/8(b). CHARGE SIDE OF COMPTROLLERS ACCOUNT.

	Sept-Aug 1449-50	April-June 1452	Account of Ninian Spot May-Oct. 1456	Nov.Aug 1491-2	Dec Dec 1495-6	Dec.-Aug. 1496-7	Aug.-May 1497-8	Very Incomplete May-Jan. 1498-9	Nov.-Mar. 1498-1500	1502-3
Crown Landed Property	£2,345- 6- 7	£ 143- 1- 4	£ 165- 4-11	£2,581-19- 6	£3,936- 0- 1	£5,015-15- 3	£4,289- 1- 4	£1,994- 3- 5	£6,954- 9- 8	£6,519- 8- 0
Sheriffs	100-17- 8	7-10- 0	23- 6- 8	268- 3-11	204- 5- 5	24- 6- 0	262-16-11	112- 4-11	274-16- 3	246- 0- 6
Burgh Baillies	68-19- 6	-	31-17- 4	52-10- 0	275- 9- 8	110-14- 0	167- 7-4	-	137- 4- 0	189- 4- 8
Custumars	674-15- 7	44- 6- 0	40- 2- 0	1,145-11-10	1,631- 8- 4	1,112- 8- 6	3,124-13- 8	657-15- 0	2,825- 7- 7	2,583- 9- 1
Justice Ayres	23- 4- 8									
Feudal Casualties	577- 0- 4									
Loan	986-12- 0	50- 0- 0								
Miscellaneous Payments	100- 0- 0	128- 0- 0	70- 0- 0							
Compositions for Charges and Letters	150- 0- 0	638- 0- 0	93- 6- 8							
Remissions for Crimes	81-15- 0									
Financial Assistance from Treasurer	221- 3- 4		449- 7- 0	736- 9- 2						1,806- 4- 0
Taxation	9- 0- 0									
Sale of Kind Farms				77-16- 8	172- 0- 0	115- 0- 0	89- 3- 0		149- 4- 0	215- 0- 0
Robert Nory	66-13- 4									
Repayment of Debt to King		129-13- 8								
Payment in Lieu of Military Service							100- 0- 0			
Tithe of Sheaves										
Chamberlain of St.Andrews										
Intromission for goods of a debtor.										
	£5,405- 8- 0	£1,140-11- 0	£ 873- 4- 9	£4,862-11- 1	£6,219- 3- 6	£6,378- 3- 9	£8,033- 2- 3	£2,764- 3- 4	£10,341- 1- 6	£11,559- 6- 3

APPENDIX B/8(b). (Contd.)

	Account 1507-1508	Aug Sept 1508	1508-9
Crown Landed Property	£7,668- 5- 2	£ 248- 2-.4	£ 9,692- 4- 4
Sheriffs	290- 0- 0 (Approx)		274-11- 7
Burgh Baillies	133- 9-10		125-14- 0
Custumars	2,272-10- 0	132-13- 0	2,411-10- 8
Justice Ayres			
Feudal Casualties			
Loan			
Miscellaneous Payments			
Compositions for Charters and Letters			
Remissions for Crimes			
Financial Assistance from Treasurer	5,271-10- 4	224-13- 4	
Taxation			
Sale of Kind Farms	150- 0- 0		741-18- 0
Robert Nory			
Repayment of Debt to King			
Payment in Lieu of Military Service			
Tithe of Sheaves	373-13- 0		
Chamberlain of St.Andrews		40- 4- 3	
Intromission of goods of a debtor		64- 0- 0	
	£16,159- 8- 7	£ 709-11-10	£13,245- 8- 7

APPENDIX B/8(c) THE DETAILS OF HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE

	1449-50 Sept-Aug	1452 Apr.-June	1491-2 Nov.-Aug.	1495-6 Dec Dec	1496-7 Dec.-July	1497-8 Aug.-May
Household Provision	£4,361-14-10	£737-15- 8	£2,690-13- 4	£3,522-10-11	£2,207-18- 5	£2,318-15- 2
Spices and Chandlery	353-16- 1	50-12- 1	608- 4- 3	956-12- 5	667-12- 5	518- 3- 1
'Uncosts'	840- 7- 1	72- 2- 5	585- 7- 7	810- 3- 0	634- 6- 6	519-6-11
Wine	-	-	362- 8- 0	559- 4- 6	524-16- 8	372- 8- 0
Stables	-	-	239- 3- 8	440- 8- 4	369- 2- 1	390-18- 9
Queen's Household (Distinct from King's)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Household Fees	87- 7-10	-	488- 0- 0	498-13- 4	461-13- 4	487-16- 8
Horse Fodder	-	-	54- 5- 0	54- 5- 0	54- 5- 0	54- 5- 0
Fees and Horse Fodder of Queen's Household	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ordinary Household Expenditure	5,555-18- 0	860-10- 2	4,485-16-10	6,288-19- 2	4,403-13- 4	4,119-11- 9
EXTRA EXPENSES						
To King's Bakers	35- 0- 0	-	-	-	-	-
Royal Army	-	-	-	629- 3- 6	490- 0- 3	-
'In Averia'	-	-	-	185- 2- 6	-	-
Wine, Wax, Sugar bought from Spaniards	-	-	-	-	-	-
King's Wedding						
TOTALS	£5,590-18- 0	£860-10- 2	£4,485-16-10	£7,100- 5- 2	£4,893-13- 7	£4,119-11-11

	1498-9 May-Jan	1498-1500 Nov. - Mar.	1502-3 Sept.-Aug	1507-8	1508-9 Sept.-Aug.	1509-10 or 1510-11
Household Provisions	£2,099-15- 7	£4,964-13- 5	£ 3,466- 9- 8	£ 7,048-11- 8	£ 6,342-15- 8	£ 7,203-14- 6
Spices and Chandlery	115- 5-10	541-18- 0	503- 1- 1	1,354-12- 4	1,206-19- 0	1,565- 5- 6
'Uncosts'	114-19-11	892-13- 0	215- 5- 5	1,001-18- 0	1,498-14- 0	1,186-18- 0
Wine	91-10- 6	643- 0-11	468-16- 4	994- 6- 9	1,291-19- 8	954- 8- 2
Stables	91- 8- 1	788- 6- 5	633- 7- 9	103- 8- 4	968-18- 1	1,072-11- 5
Queen's Household (Distinct from King's)	-	-	-	1,099- 5- 0	273-16-10	-
Household Fees	-	882-10- 0	659-13- 4	738- 6- 8	698-13- 4	669-13- 4
Horse Fodder	-	115-10- 0	50-15- 0	66-10- 0	64-15- 0	53-15- 0
Fees and Horse Fodder of Queen's Household	-	-	-	251-13- 4	232-13- 4	236- 3- 4
Ordinary Household Expenditure	2,513- 0- 0	7,830-11- 9	5,287- 0- 3	12,658-12- 1	11,583- 3- 4	11,992-17- 9
EXTRA EXPENSES						
To King's Bakers	-					
Royal Army	-					
'In Averia'	-					
Wine, Wax, Sugar bought from Spaniards	73-10- 6					
King's Wedding			6,125- 3- 6			
TOTALS	£2,586-10- 6	£7,830-11- 9	£11,412- 3- 9	£12,658-12- 1	£11,583- 3- 4	£11,992-17- 7

APPENDIX B/8(d) COST OF ANNUAL FEES AND ALLOWANCES FOR HORSE FODDER TO HOUSEHOLD SERVANTS

	1449-50	1491-2	1495-6	1496-7	1497-8
Fees	£84- 7-10	£488- 0- 0	£498-13- 4	£461-13- 4	£487-16- 8
Horse Fodder	-	54- 5- 0	54- 5- 0	54- 5- 0	54- 5- 0
Fees & Horse Fodder of Queen's Household	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	£84- 7-10	£542- 5- 0	£552-18- 4	£515-18- 4	£542- 1- 8

	1498-1500	1502-3	1507-8	1508-9	1510
Fees	882-10- 0	659-13- 4	738- 6- 8	698-13- 4	669-13- 4
Horse Fodder	115-10- 0	50-15- 0	66-10- 0	64-15- 0	53-15- 0
Fees and Horse Fodder of Queen's Household	-	-	251-13- 4	232-13- 4	236- 3- 4
TOTAL FOR KING'S HOUSEHOLD ONLY	-	-	£804-16- 8	£763- 8- 4	£723- 8- 4
TOTAL	£998- 0- 0	£710- 8-4	£1,056-10- 0	£996- 1- 8	£959-11- 8

APPENDIX B/8(e) MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD FOOD ACCOUNTS AS RECORDED IN 'LIBER EMPTORUM' 1 Sept 1511-6 Aug 1512 (SRO E32/1)

1511	October	£382- 1- 9
	November	£465- 0- 9
	December	£1,334- 0- 5
1512	January	£504- 0- 5
	February	£502- 4- 8
	March	£337- 9- 6
	April	£518- 0- 9
	May	£573-12-10
	June	£491- 3- 1
	July	£530-13- 7
	August to 6th	£268-10- 1

The September figure is not certain thro' mutilation of manuscript.

Daily Total for the month of January

Day	⁂ Sunday	Day	
1	£26- 3- 1	17 ⁂	£10- 7- 4
2	8- 0- 4	18	27- 7- 2
3 ⁂	10- 7- 2	19	14-15- 1
4	17-18- 3	20	17- 3- 9
5	22- 5- 6	21	16- 8-11
6	22-18- 0	22	17- 9- 1
7	11- 8- 3	23	6-17- 6
8	17- 1-10	24 ⁂	8-41- 7
9	9- 0- 2	25	27- 3- 2
10 ⁂	7-15- 9	26	23- 6- 8
11	18-12- 4	27	19-17- 0
12	24-17-10	28	11- 9- 3
13	16-18- 0	29	19-12- 9
14	7-15-11	30	9- 3-10
15	16- 8- 5	31	4-18- 7
16	7- 1- 1	TOTAL	£504- 0- 5

APPENDIX B/8(f) The Bill of Household Maid the Fifte Day of Januare the Yere of God $1^{m}v^{c}$ and Sevin Yeris.

(SRO Exchequer Household Papers and Accounts E34/1)

	Servants Allowed
Earl of Angus, Master of the Household	8
Bishop of Aberdeen, keeper of privy seal	6
Treasurer	8
Master Gavin Dunbar, clerk of the Register	3
Master Patrick Paniter, Secretary	3
Robert Colville, the director of the Chancery	2

BISHOPS AND PRELATES

Archbishop of St.Andrews	8
" " Glasgow	8
Bishop of Dunkeld	4
" " Moray	4
" " Ross	4
" " Argyle	4
Prior of St.Andrews	3
Abbot of Holyrood	3
" " Cambuskenneth	3
Dean of Glasgow	2
" " Aberdeen	2
Parson of Kilmartin	1

THE LORDS TEMPORAL

Earl of Errol, constable	4
Earl Marischal	4
Earl of Bothwell, admiral	4
Chamberlain (Lord Hume)	4
Earl of Huntly	4
Earl of Arran	4
Earl of Montrose	4
Earl of Glencairn	4
Earl of Eglington	4
Lord Gray, justiciar	4
Lord Semple	3
Lord Crichton of Sanquhar	3
Lord of Ross	3

THE LORDS TEMPORAL	Servants Allowed
Sir John Ramsey	2
Sir George Dundas	2
Sir John Stirling, deputy master of the Household	3

KINGS CHAMBER	Servants Allowed
Lord Avondale, master usher	4
Andrew Wood	1
James Stewart	1
George Barde	1
Sir Adam Hepburn, master Steward	3
Master of Gray, carver	3
Lord Hume, cupbearer	None
Sir Patrick Crichton, pantler	2
James Hume, yeoman	

Sir Patrick Newlands
Sir Alan Marshall
Sir Alexander Buchan
Sir William Simpson
Sir William Ayton
Sir William Fresall
Sir John Moon
Sir John Jacklin
Sir John Sharpe
Sir James Gorton

The Six Children

WINE CELLAR	Servants Allowed
Laird of Fastcastle, master of the wine cellar	2
Robin Douglas	1
John Douglas	

WARDROBE

Sir Patrick Crichton, master of Wardrobe	2
James Dog	
John Forman	
Henry Robinson, mender and hanger of arras	
Robin Cutler, armourer	
James Jacklin, barber	
Dowik, laundress	
Alan Cochran, armourer	

GUNNERS

4 with 4 servants (including a French smith)

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD	Servants Allowed
The Comptroller, James Redheuch	8
The Comptroller's Clerk (included in the 8 servants)	
Abbot of Jedburgh, clerk of the Household accounts	3
Master of John Chisholm, clerk of the writers of the book	1
Parson of Linlithgow, Steward	2
James Edmonstone, master of Silver Plate	1
John Balfour, yoeman of the pewter	1
John Wallace, yoeman of silver plate	
William Douglas, Master of the breadhouse	1
Master William Dempster	
William Forsythe in the 'curte' or small pantry	
Mitchell Balfour, master of the ale cellar	1
David Balfour	
John Kirkwood, master of the Larder	1
John Flemming, yoeman	
Alexander Kirkwood	
The master flesher	

Marshals

USHERS OF THE HALL

John Knox

David Balfour

John Yestir

PURSUIVANTS

Unicorn

Bute

Ormond

Carrick

MACERS

Adam Nesbit

William Campbell

Scrimgeour

Ramsey

MESSENGERS

Duncan Riche

'And the laif that bens ye avinis'

FALCONERS

Sir Alexander MacCulloch 2

Hannay Robert Falconer Alexander Law David Falconer

'And the falconaris bens halkis'.

KNIGHTS IN ATTENDANCE

Each had 2 Servants

The Master of Atholl	Sir John Somerville
Sir Duncan Campbell	Sir David Hume
Sir William Cockburn	Sir Alexander Seton
Sir William Scott	Sir Patrick Hamilton
Sir William Murray	Sir James Shaw
Sir Hary Shaw	Sir Alexander Cunningham
Sir William Edmonstone	Sir Andrew Murray
Sir David Graham	The Laird of Lundy

---

1 Servant each, except Donald of the Isles who had none

Archiblad Bikkerton
Adam Cockburn
William Boswell
John Balfour
Matthew Campbell
Donald of the Isles
Maurice Buchanan
Laird of Dunlop
James Stewart

SQUIRES OF ATTENDANCE

	Servants allowed
Master Alexander Ogilvy	1
Master William Ogilvy	2
Alexander Elphinstone	2
Thomas Boswell	2
Patrick Sinclair	2
Robert Moncrieff	1
Hew Douglas	1
Colin Campbell	1
John Lindsay	1
John Affleck	1
John Murray	1
John Bikkerton	1
George Campbell	1
James Sinclair	1
James Meldrum	1
John Rowolo	1
Quentin Fokkart	1
Walter Trunbull	1
George Shaw	1

	Servants Allowed
Alexander McCulloch	1
James Edmonstone	1
(Scored out, Sir Andrew Murray and Sir David Graham)	
Andrew Ayton	2
Flory Auchmonty	

FURRIER

Sir Simon Preston	2

Sir John Forman, master Porter	2
John Killoch	1
William Balfour	1
The laird of Lestalrig	2
Master Alexander Stewart, dean of Dunbar	2

CUPBEARERS

Robin Coppar
Alexander Coppar
Alexander Douglas

'CATOURES'

Robin Moncur
Robin Button
George Stirling, in the petty larder

KING'S STABLES

Robin Galloway, in the avery	1
Andrew Doule	1
James Douglas	1
James Scott	
Gavin Bailye	
Alexander Gowan	

KING'S KITCHEN

Thomas Shaw, master cook	2
Flemming, yeorman in the spithouse	
2 yoeman in the kitchen	
2 " " " "	
2 'Turnbrochis' in the kitchen	
Hamber	
Gilbert Watson	

THE 'COURTE' IN SMALL KITCHEN	Servants Allowed
William Arth	
Usher of the kitchen	1
Gourlan Forman	
2 Yoemen	
2 Grooms	
2 'turnbrochis'	

BROUSTERS	BAKERS
Richard Brouster	Thomas Graw
Andrew Brouster	Martin Hunter

TRUMPETERS

Thomas Pringle
Castillan
Petty John
Thomas Kirkpatrick
Young Pringle

Duncan Dawson
Bonny groom in the hall
The candleman

HERALDS	
Lion King of Arms	2
Marchmond	1
Snowdon	1

CHAPLAINS OF THE CLOSET	
Provost of Lincluden, master almoner	2
Master James Merchistan	1
Master David Douglas	1
Master John Seives	1
Master Andrew Haliburton	1
Master James Stewart	2
Master Cuthbert Bailye	2
Master John Bruce	
Master Andrew Makbrek	1

			Servants Allowed
DOCTORS		**APOTHECARIES**	
Doctor Bailye	2	William Fowler	
Master Mitchell Kerr	1	John Mosman	

HENCHMEN

Sir Cristall
Sir John Stirling — 1
Hannie
Walter Stirling
Andrew Hume — 1
James Hamilton
Baron
Martin

PAGES

Graham
Halyday
Tailyour

GROOM OF THE CHAMBER	**MINSTRALS**	
John Wood	Alexander Wardlaw	
James Jacklin	The Italians	1
John Campbell	The French Minstrals	
Adam		

THE KING'S CHAPEL ROYAL

Master David Abercrombie, subdean	1
Master Alexander Shaw, chanter	1
Treasurer	1
Master David Trail, sacrist	1
Sir Thomas Galbraith	
Sir Ninian Spottiswood	
Nicholas Abernethy	
Thomas Clark	
Sir John Tod	
John Goldsmith	
Sir Robert Wemyss	
Sir Thomas Dallrimpill	
Sir William Sterrat	
Sir John Murray	

APPENDIX B/8(g) HOUSEHOLD OFFICES, SERVANTS AND FEES FROM COMPTROLLER'S ACCOUNTS OF 1496 & 1509

	1496		1509	
£20				
Keeper of Silver Vessels	James Edmonstone			+ Extra 10 mks
		1st Porter	Sir John Forman	
20 Marks				
1st Usher of King's Chamber	Sir Robert Lundy of Balgony		Andrew Lord Avondale	
Master of Stables	Sir Adam Hepburn of Ogston			
Pantler	Sir Patrick Crichton			
Butler	Sir Archibald Edmonstone			
Master of Wardrobe	Sir Peter Crichton			
Marshals	David Forsyth	Sir John Stewart	Thomas Forrester	
	James Merser	John Inglis	Thomas French	
	Thomas French	James Merser	Robert Callendar	
	Walter Lesley	Thomas Bikkertoun		
Usher of Outer Chamber	William Sinclair	George Boyd	James Boswell & James Stewart	each 1 Term
Cupbearer	Alex. Master of Hume			
Carver	Patrick, Master of Gray			
£10				
Clerk of Household Books	Henry Alan	Clerk of Rolls		
King's Steward	John Stirling	King's Steward		
Steward of Household	James Redheuch	Steward of Household		
Butcher	Donald Crom		John Brisbane	
Furrier	William Fery	Furrier		
Tailor	John Steel	Tailor		
Doorkeepers	John Kinloch ✕			
	William Balfour ✕			

1496

Chief Cook — Thomas Shaw ✠

Barber — James Jacklin

Ormond Pursuivant ✠

1 Veteran by king's special mandate

Kyntire pursuivant

10 Marks

6 Marks

In Pantry	James Lamb
In Wine Cellar	Robert Douglas
In Hall Pantry	William Forsyth
In Ale Cellar	Michael Balfour
In Larder	John Kirkwood
In Pantry	William Douglas
In Pantry	William Douglas
Master Cook of Hall	William Erth
Ushers of The Hall	James Dog
	William Spicehouse
	David Caldwell
	George Stirling
	John Caldwell
In Avery	Charles Maxton
	William Liddall

1509

(20 mks) Extra 5 mks

Butler — William Edmonstone of Duntreath

(4 mks)

In Spicers — Thomas Shaw

(6 mks)

In Buttery — Michael Balfour

(4 mks)

Keeper of Stone Vessels — John Balfour

In Household Pantry

David Balfour extra 2 mks.

John Knox

Robert Gallway

1496

6 Marks

In Small Larder — John Cant

Keeper of Napery — Alex. Stevenson

1509

George Stirling

John Yestir (5 mks)

Purchaser — Robert Moncur (4 mks)

Tawyer — Andrew Doule

John Davidson

In Wardrobe — James Dog, John Forman (4 mks)

Usher of Kitchen — Henry Dempster (4 mks)

Coalman — Duncan Dawson

Harnesmaker — James Douglas

1 in the Spicery

5 Marks

Clerks and Abreviators of Accounts Purchasers — Richard Brewster, Alex. Brewster, Thomas Alan, Henry Mair, Alex. Gryme

Clerk of Rolls — Thomas Craginzet

Clark of Account .

Abreviator of Household Account

John Murray

Brewers — John Bannerman and Andrew Brewster (4 mks)

Purchaser of Fish — Robert Beaton

	1496		1509
4 Marks			
Purchaser of Fish	Donald Dow	Grooms of Chamber	John Paterson
King's Stables	Andrew Doule		Alexander Gordon
	John Terras		Michael Donaldson
	Alexander Lyle		Patrick Donaldson
	Patrick Gildow		James Scott
	Thomas Forest		James Jacklin
	Hector Lowry		John Wood
	James Avery		Campbell
	1 Smith	Bearer of Crossbows	William Dylly
In King's Chamber	William Crichton		John Inglis
	Thomas Paite		
In Court Buttery	Alexander Balfour		
In King's Wine Cellar	John Douglas		Extra 2 mks.
In Larder	John Flemming		
In Spicery	Patrick Roule		
In Court Pantry	William Danielson		
Candlemaker	Alexander Murray		
Preserver of Hides & Pelts	Thomas Bell		
Sub Keeper of Silver Vessels	John Wallace		Andrew Stewart
Keeper of Stone Vessels	John Watson		
Keeper of 'Mule'	Donald		
Cup Bearers	Arthur Lyon		Patrick Copper
	Robert Copper		
	David Stevenson		Alex. Littlejohn
Coalman	John Leche		

	1496		1509
Nurse	Margaret Musgie		Dovoch
Usher of Kitchen	William Myreton		
Cook	Gilchrist		
	Gilbert		
	Alex. Cuke		Malcolm Gryme
	Alex. Furrour		Gourla
	Cars		Ersman
	Robert	Sub Keeper of Stone Vessels	Robert Cuke
		In Buttery	Leo Taylor
			David Balfour
2 Marks			
Groom of the Hall	Malcolm		
2 Grooms in King's Kitchen		In king's and Household kitchen	John Thompson, Kerswell
2 Groom in household kitchen			Patrick Cook, Butoun
5 'Turwebrochis' in kitchen for winter clothing £3-6-8			£3-6-8

Additional Fees

Esquire	John Auchinlek, Maurice Buchanan	@ 2 mks each
Snowdon and Ilay Heralds		@ 2 mks each
Garioch, Ormond & Carrick Pursuivants		@ £10 each
Macers	William Campbell, John Schevel	@ £10 each
Messengers	David Templeman, David Younger	
	Richard Brown, Jas. Wallace	
	Robert Reid, Gilbert Rutherfor	
	Duncan Riche, The late Beg	each 4 mks.
Ex Messenger	John Couper	£2-13- 4

APPENDIX B/8(h) THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL COMPTROLLERS' ACCOUNTS

DATE	COMPTROLLER	PRESENT CHARGE	ARREARS	TOTAL CHARGE	DISCHARGE	TOTAL BALANCE	BALANCE FOR PRESENT ACCOUNT	
Sept Aug 1449 1450	Alexander Napier	£ 5,405- 8- 0	£ -	£5,405- 8- 0	£6,721- 3-10	£ 1,315-15-10	£ 1,315-15-10	
Apr June 1452 1452	George Scheriswood	1,140-11- 0	21- 2-11	1,119- 8- 1	1,270-15- 1	151- 7- 0	130- 4- 1	'Eque' achieved in the account thrô' later payments from outside account
Nov Aug 1491 1492	Hugh Martin	4,856- 4- 5	-	4,856- 4- 5	5,699- 8- 5	843- 4- 0	843- 4- 0	
Dec Dec 1495 1496	Sir Duncan Forrester	6,219- 3- 6	1,811-19-11	4,407- 3- 7	8,001-18- 1	3,594-14- 6	1,782-14- 7	
Dec Aug 1496 1497	Ibid	6,378- 3- 9	3,594-14- 7	2,783- 9- 3	5,781- 8- 8	2,997-19- 5	596-15- 1	
Aug May 1497 1498	Ibid	8,033- 2- 3	2,997-19- 5	5,035- 2-10	5,029- 5- 4	5-17- 6	3,003-16-11	
MAY Nov 1498 1498	Ibid		5-17- 6	ACCOUNT INCOMPLETE				
Nov Mar 1498 1500	Sir Patrick Hume of Polmont	10,341- 1- 6	-	10,341- 1- 6	9,745- 4- 0	595-17- 6	595-17- 6	
1502-3	John Stirling	11,659- 6- 3	735-10- 5	12,394-16- 8	12,384-16-10	990- 0- 2	1,725-10- 7	
1507-8	James Redheuch	16,159- 8- 7	-	16,159- 8- 7	15,719- 8-11	439-19- 8	439-19- 8	
Aug Sept 1508	Ibid	709-10-11	439-19- 8	1,149-11- 6	1,285-15-11	136- 4- 5	576- 4- 1	
Sept Aug 1508 1509	Sir Duncan Forrester	13,245- 8- 7	-	13,245- 8- 7	13,004- 1- 1	241- 7- 6	241- 7- 6	
1510					13,247- 8- 6			

APPENDIX B/8(i) EXPANSION OF LANDED WEALTH OF JAMES REDHEUCH, COMPTROLLER

1. PURCHASE OF LAND

R.M.S No.	DATE	PURCHASED FROM	LAND	DISTRICT
2666	5 Sept 1502	William Ayson of Fornoch	Tullchedill, called 'Culturagane'	Strathearn
2688	29 Jan 1502-3	Alex. Winton of Alldate	Tullichedill	"
2726	13 June 1503	William Edmonstone of Duntreath	Ardbechlorn, Dereye	"
3372	17 Aug 1509	John Drummond of Petzallon	Dunduff	"
3485	11 July 1510	John Cumry	25/- of East Mego, now @ £4	"
			1 Mark of Cur	"
3498	24 Aug 1510	Sir Robert Menzies, Laird of Wemyss	8 Marks of Drumsrosk	Perth

---

2. CROWN LEASES AND FEUS 1502-7 (ER, Vol xii)

	STRATHEARN		ANNUAL RENT
Part of Drumquharagane called Mulrush			£ 1- 6- 8
1/6	Drumfingal		1- 3- 4
2/3	Dalmerglen		5- 6- 8
½	East Aberlednach		8- 0- 0
	West Aberlednach	with his wife Margaret	16- 0- 0
	Aberlednach and 'le lagane'		5- 6- 8
½	Thomperon		1- 6- 8
	Dalsky		4- 0- 0
	Little Coldoch		5- 6- 8
	Mill of Aberlednach	with his son James	10- 0- 0
	Finteloch		10- 0- 0
	MENTEITH		
	East Coldoch	and wife Margaret	5- 0- 0
	Part of Cessintuly		2- 5- 0
	DIRLETON		
	West Fenton		15 chalders of corn and barley of Victuals.

TOTAL ANNUAL FARM PAID TO CROWN £74- 1- 8, 15 chalders of Victuals.

APPENDIX B/9(a) TOTAL RECEIPTS OF TREASURER 1488-1513

MONTHS	44		31		18		19		41		18		13		11	
	June 1488	Feb 1492	June 1494	Jan - 7	Jan 1497	July - 8	Feb 1501	Sept - 2	Sept 1502	Feb - 5	Feb 1505	Aug - 6	Aug 1506	Sept - 7	Sept 1507	Aug - 8
Receipts from Sheriffs	£ 1,271- 3- 3		£ 2,257-10- 9		£ 1,146- 1- 4		£5,189 - 8- 2		£ 7,393-11- 7		£ 5,033- 1- 6		£ 2,936- 3-11		£ 2,689- 9- 4	
Justice Ayre Compositions			1,305-10- 0		2,139-19- 8		3,356-15- 2		3,637- 7- 3		2,964-13-11		959- 6- 2		583-16- 8	
Remissions outside Ayre			430- 0- 0		236-13- 4		1,663-11- 4		974-17- 2		919-13- 4		615- 0- 0		110- 0- 0	
Escheats Compositions			223- 6- 8		260- 9- 4		881- 0- 4		2,083-11- 0		399-10- 0		324-13- 4		76-13- 4	
Compositions for Error			760- 0- 0				103- 0- 0									
Chamberlain Ayre Compositions																
Compositions for Feudal Incidents			1,183- 6- 8		522- 0- 0		4,051- 0- 0		7,269- 5- 5		5,738- 8- 9		3,402- 9- 8		2,550-12- 5	
Compositions for Charters			181- 3- 4		3,509- 6- 8		3,106-19- 7		6,442- 8-10		8,832-19- 4		7,528-10- 2		3,495- 8-11	
Total Compositions	5,610-14- 0															
Total of Above	£6,881-17- 3		£6,340-17- 5		£7,814-10- 4		£18,351-14- 7		£27,801- 1- 3		£23,888- 6-10		£15,766- 3- 3		£9,506- 0- 8	
Ferms of Land in Crown Hands					166-13- 4		411- 8- 8		1,826- 3- 2		1,496-11- 9		956-17- 3		714- 9- 9	
Profit from Minting					747-13- 0		82-10- 0				1,915-12- 0		2,197-16- 6		2,530- 3- 9	
Fee From Great Seal							406- 6- 8		588-19- 4		844-11- 4		190- 0- 0		184- 9- 0	
James III's Treasure	£24,517-10- 0															
OVERALL TOTAL	£32,748-18- 1		£7,382-12- 5		£13,854-12- 8		£19,780- 7- 7		£66,918- 3- 1		£45,635- 2-10		£24,488-10- 8		£20,083- 3- 0	
AVERAGE P.A.			£5,309- 0- 0								£20,512- 0- 0					

APPENDIX B/9(a) TOTAL RECEIPTS OF TREASURER 1488-1513

MONTHS	44		31		18		19		41		18		13		11	
	June 1488	Feb 1492	June 1494	Jan - 7	Jan 1497	July - 8	Feb 1501	Sept - 2	Sept 1502	Feb - 5	Feb 1505	Aug - 6	Aug 1506	Sept - 7	Sept 1507	Aug - 8
Receipts from Sheriffs	£ 1,271- 3- 3		£ 2,257-10- 9		£ 1,146- 1- 4		£5,189 - 8- 2		£ 7,393-11- 7		£ 5,033- 1- 6		£ 2,936- 3-11		£ 2,689- 9- 4	
Justice Ayre Compositions			1,305-10- 0		2,139-19- 8		3,356-15- 2		3,637- 7- 3		2,964-13-11		959- 6- 2		583-16- 8	
Remissions outside Ayre			430- 0- 0		236-13- 4		1,663-11- 4		974-17- 2		919-13- 4		615- 0- 0		110- 0- 0	
Escheats Compositions			223- 6- 8		260- 9- 4		881- 0- 4		2,083-11- 0		399-10- 0		324-13- 4		76-13- 4	
Compositions for Error			760- 0- 0				103- 0- 0									
Chamberlain Ayre Compositions																
Compositions for Feudal Incidents			1,183- 6- 8		522- 0- 0		4,051- 0- 0		7,269- 5- 5		5,738- 8- 9		3,402- 9- 8		2,550-12- 5	
Compositions for Charters			181- 3- 4		3,509- 6- 8		3,106-19- 7		6,442- 8-10		8,832-19- 4		7,528-10- 2		3,495- 8-11	
Total Compositions	5,610-14- 0															
Total of Above	£6,881-17- 3		£6,340-17- 5		£7,814-10- 4		£18,351-14- 7		£27,801- 1- 3		£23,888- 6-10		£15,766- 3- 3		£9,506- 0- 8	
Ferms of Land in Crown Hands					166-13- 4		411- 8- 8		1,826- 3- 2		1,496-11- 9		956-17- 3		714- 9- 9	
Profit from Minting					747-13- 0		82-10- 0				1,915-12- 0		2,197-16- 6		2,530- 3- 9	
Fee From Great Seal							406- 6- 8		588-19- 4		844-11- 4		190- 0- 0		184- 9- 0	
James III's Treasure	£24,517-10- 0															
OVERALL TOTAL	£32,748-18- 1		£7,382-12- 5		£13,854-12- 8		£19,780- 7- 7		£66,918- 3- 1		£45,635- 2-10		£24,488-10- 8		£20,083- 3- 0	
AVERAGE P.A.			£5,309- 0- 0								£20,512- 0- 0					

MONTHS	12	2	10
	Aug 1511 - Aug 12	Aug 1512 - Oct 1512	Oct 1512 - Aug 13
.Receipts from Sheriffs	£ 565-19- 4	£ 28- 0- 0	£ 256-12- 5
Justice Ayre Compositions	8,047- 3-10	-	186- 6- 0
Remissions outside Ayre	3,690- 1- 8	-	1,460- 0- 0
Escheat Compositions	301- 0- 0	-	128- 0- 0
Compositions for Error			
Chamberlain Ayre Compositions	1,536-12- 9		
Compositions for Feudal Incidents	1,102- 3- 4	-	3,067- 6- 8
Compositions for Charters	4,522-11- 9	1,566-13- 4	1,260- 6- 8
Total Compositions			
Total of Above	£19,765-12- 8	£1,594-13- 4	£6,358-11- 9
Ferms of Land in Crown Hands	499- 8-10		43-16- 0
Profit from Minting	7,621- 0- 2	301-16- 5	346- 0- 0
Fee form Great Seal			
James III's Treasure			
OVERALL TOTAL	£31,338-11- 8	£1,891- 8-11	£10,275-10- 9
AVERAGE P.A.	£31,338-11- 8		£12,167- 0- 0

NOTES

1. Of the last, there are several items which the treasurer alleged 'ar untakin up be him and award, quhilkis he is chargeit with, that schawis at lenth on the tother syde', totalling £891-13 4. (TA, i, 196-7)

2. Probably £1,817-0-8, the rest of last account.

3. In addition to the rest, thre were a series of entries totalling £515-6-8 'of the quhilkis the comptare sais he has obligacionis and in his bukis. And thairfore he and thai to be callit for the payment thairof'. (TA, i, 205-6)
There was also a series of 'Memoranda' which appeared to be entries made at various times after the audit regarding payments supposedly made to Lord St.John but which he remained 'unchargeit', which amounted to £1,101-17-10. (TA, i, 207-8)

4. As in 3 income during the Treasurer's tenure of office 'that he chargis him nocht with 'suppas thai pertenit to his office' totalling at least £7,444-13-4. (TA, i, 220-222)

5. Written at the 1498 Exchequer, a series of charge entries of Abbot of Paisley, dated from accounts ranging from 1498 to 1506. Total £374-0-0 (TA, i, 272)

6. No charge for this discharge and part of the discharge is also wanting. Actual date of start of this account is uncertain, but there seems to have been considerable overlap with the previous account. The only clue to the nature of this account is that it contained only one section, a 'Bursa Regis', which in the previous account is extremely abbreviated.

7. A memorandum related that the Treasurer was not charged with the composition of the justice ayre at Inverness, dated January 1497-8, at £1,254-3-4 and the obligation remained with him. It continued that £782-4-7 of the sum was charged to the Treasurer in his account rendered in February 1499-1500.

8. Arrears total represented sums received by the present Treasurer after the death of Robert Lundy as it appeared at the foot of Rebert's account from the obligations made to Robert.

9. Total exclusive of £321-0-0 in Flemish groats.

10. Arrears included - £7,432-8-7, the superexpenditure of last account rendered at the Exchequer and a further = £2,036-6-2, the superexpenses of his account as Receiver after the Exchequer.

APPENDIX B/9(b) GENERAL EXPENSES OF THE TREASURER

	JOHN LAIGN, BISHOP OF GLASGOW	SIR WILLIAM KNOLLIS, LORD ST. JOHN			GEORGE SHAW, ABBOT OF PAISLEY			Sir ROBERT LUNDY OF BALGONY
	AUG DEC 1473-4	JUNE MAY 1488-90	May FEB 1490-2	FEB AUG 1492-1492	JUNE NOV 1494-5	NOV JAN 1495-1497	APRIL JAN 1496-7	FEB JULY 1497-1498
Wardrobe : King	£ 639- 0- 5	£ 2,054- 6- 1	£ 845- 4- 1	£ 707-14-11	£1,384-19-10	£1,171- 5- -	£ -	£ -
" : Queen	757- 9-10							
" : Prince	72- 7-10							
" : Royal Family and Others	138-13- 3	600-14- 5	368- 7- 9	165- 0-11	341-14-10	494- 4- 2	-	-
Alms and Offerings	89- 8- 9	Bursa Regis	182- 0- 0	48- 0- 0	293-15- 0	Bursa Regis	-	148-19- 6
Fees,Pensions,Rewards Payments by Royal Precepts	593-18- 4	Bursa Regis	Bursa Regis	-	1,081- 5- 0	-	-	-
Livery	225- 8- 0	308- 4- 9	270- 1- 1	-	1,055- 8- 3	574- 5- 3	-	-
Building Expenses		229- 3- 3	698-19-11	308-16- 7	-	-	789-12-11	1,951- 1- 9
Artillery Expenses	753- 6- 5	515- 4- 3	20-16- 0	336-13- 4	16- 0- 6	80- 0- 0	490- 7- 9	1,265-14- 8
Naval Expenses	-	-	-	-	596- 1-11	88- 0- 0	22-15- 6	155- 0- 8
Diplomatic Expenses	-	516- 0- 0	1,001-18- 0	-	70- 0- 0	10- 0- 0	977- 3- 8	1,488-12- 2
'Bursa Regis'	627-17-11	8,555- 0-10	6,157- 2-10	2,600-13-11		860-16- 8	5,789-11- 8	? No Total
To Comptroller	-	3,300- 0- 0	417- 0- 5	440-19- 9				
Justice Eyre Expenses					528-11- 6			
Discharges & Quittances					1,147- 0- 0	233- 6- 8		
Money Delivered to King					608-13- 4			
Business Conducted Abroad								
Pension to Queen								
Purchase of Raw Materials								
To Queen's Steward								
ARREARS	-£523-13-10	-	-					
TOTAL CHARGE	£3,240-19- 9	£31,857- 4- 9		£5,196- 1- 8		£7,382-12- 5	£4,869-10- 8*	£13,854-12- 8
DISCHARGE	£3,896-10- 9	£30,076-14- 0*	£9,963-10- 1	£4,607-19- 5		£10,635- 8- 4	£8,069-11- 1	
BALANCE	-£1,179- 4-10		£1,817- 0- 8	£ 488- 2- 3		-£ 3,252-15-10	-£3,200- 0- 4	

*Part of Account Missing, only £16,078-13-11 Recorded

*Charge Wanting

APPENDIX B/9(b)

GENERAL EXPENSES OF THE TREASURER

	JOHN LAIGN, BISHOP OF GLASGOW	SIR WILLIAM KNOLLIS, LORD ST. JOHN			GEORGE SHAW, ABBOT OF PAISLEY			Sir ROBERT LUNDY OF BALGONY
	AUG DEC 1473-4	JUNE MAY 1488-90	May FEB 1490-2	FEB AUG 1492-1492	JUNE NOV 1494-5	NOV JAN 1495-1497	APRIL JAN 1496-7	FEB JULY 1497-1498
Wardrobe : King	£ 639- 0- 5	£ 2,054- 6- 1	£ 845- 4- 1	£ 707-14-11	£1,384-19-10	£1,171- 5- -	£ -	£ -
" : Queen	757- 9-10							
" : Prince	72- 7-10							
" : Royal Family and Others	138-13- 3	600-14- 5	368- 7- 9	165- 0-11	341-14-10	494- 4- 2	-	-
Alms and Offerings	89- 8- 9	Bursa Regis	182- 0- 0	48- 0- 0	293-15- 0	Bursa Regis	-	148-19- 6
Fees,Pensions,Rewards Payments by Royal Precepts	593-18- 4	Bursa Regis	Bursa Regis	-	1,081- 5- 0	-	-	-
Livery	225- 8- 0	308- 4- 9	270- 1- 1	-	1,055- 8- 3	574- 5- 3	-	-
Building Expenses		229- 3- 3	698-19-11	308-16- 7	-	-	789-12-11	1,951- 1- 9
Artillery Expenses	753- 6- 5	515- 4- 3	20-16- 0	336-13- 4	16- 0- 6	80- 0- 0	490- 7- 9	1,265-14- 8
Naval Expenses	-	-	-	-	596- 1-11	88- 0- 0	22-15- 6	155- 0- 8
Diplomatic Expenses	-	516- 0- 0	1,001-18- 0	-	70- 0- 0	10- 0- 0	977- 3- 8	1,488-12- 2
'Bursa Regis'	627-17-11	8,555- 0-10	6,157- 2-10	2,600-13-11		860-16- 8	5,789-11- 8	? No Total
To Comptroller	-	3,300- 0- 0	417- 0- 5	440-19- 9				
Justice Eyre Expenses					528-11- 6			
Discharges & Quittances					1,147- 0- 0	233- 6- 8		
Money Delivered to King					608-13- 4			
Business Conducted Abroad								
Pension to Queen								
Purchase of Raw Materials								
To Queen's Steward								
ARREARS	-£523-13-10	-	-					
TOTAL CHARGE	£3,240-19- 9	£31,857- 4- 9		£5,196- 1- 8		£7,382-12- 5	£4,869-10- 8*	£13,854-12- 8
DISCHARGE	£3,896-10- 9	£30,076-14- 0*	£9,963-10- 1	£4,607-19- 5		£10,635- 8- 4	£8,069-11- 1	
BALANCE	-£1,179- 4-10		£1,817- 0- 8	£ 488- 2- 3		-£ 3,252-15-10	-£3,200- 0- 4	

*Part of Account Missing, only £16,078-13-11 Recorded

*Charge Wanting

	DAVID BEATON OF CREICH		JAMES BEATON OF DUNFERMLINE			ANDREW STEWART BISHOP OF CAITHNESS		CUTHBERT BAILLIE
	Feb SEPT 1501 - 1502	SEPT FEB 1502 - 1505	FEB AUG 1505 - 1506	AUG SEPT 1506- 1507	SEPT AUG 1507 - 8	AUG AUG 1511 - 2	AUG OCT 1512 - 1512	OCT AUG 1512 - 1513
Wardrobe : King	£ 2,058- 7- 9	£10,559-12- 8	£ 2,125-13-11	£ 2,425- 1- 9	£ 1,530- 7- 9	£ 1,341- 3- 4	£ 84- 3- 4	£ 288-19- 3
" : Queen	-			837-12-11	491- 0- 6	1,037- 4- 9	7- 8- 0	184-12- 2
" : Prince	-	-	-	410-12- 8	27- 0- 2	19-16- 5	-	-
" : Royal Family and Others	503- 9- 3	193- 2- 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alms and Offerings	1,039- 6- 3	2,712-15-10	1,626-13- 3	1,139-10- 6	972- 8- 6	951-11- 2	-	302- 6- 1
Fees,Pensions,Rewards Payments by Royal Precepts	1,178-15- 8	3,577- 5- 8	1,937-11- 6	1,622-14- 4	1,227- 7- 9	2,750- 5- 2	25- 6- 0	1,610-10- 3
Livery	887- 8- 4	3,961- 0- 1	1,096- 2- 6	1,589-19- 0	1,519- 5- 1	3,676- 5- 0	29-17- 0	346- 9- 3
Building Expenses	5,181-18- 6	9,467- 3- 4*	4,295- 4- 1*	1,582-16- 4	969-15- 3	2,900-18- 2	140- 1- 0	443- 9- 0
Artillery Expenses	-	-	-	-		178- 3- 8	-	30- 0- 0
Naval Expenses	-	2,457- 5- 0*	6,182-18- 0*	8,080- 3- 2	3,951-11- 4	14,611-19- 5	511- 0- 2	2,604-15- 8
Diplomatic Expenses	586- 0- 4	1,220-17- 3	749-13- 4	1,660-12- 1	895-13- 3	1,433-13- 4	8- 8- 0	265- 3- 0
'Bursa Regis'	5,003- 1- 9	9,342-11- 3	4,657-17- 4	4,804-13- 5	5,016- 4- 1	9,869-19-10	686-12- 5	3,213- 8- 4
To Comptroller		5,294- 4- 7	7,372-18- 1	4,355-16-10	6,804-18- 4			856- 0- 0
Justice Ayre Expenses	761-12- 2	1,348- 7- 6	664-18-11	286-16-10	43-10- 0			
Discharges & Quittances								
Money Delivered to King								
Business Conducted Abroad		9,996- 7- 6	2,700- 6- 8	3,277-11- 5	3,277-11- 5			
Pension to Queen		1,000- 0- 0	1,000- 0- 0	1,200- 0- 0	1,300- 0- 0			
Purchase of Raw Materials				902-13-11	3,117-16- 1			933- 1- 4
To Queen's Steward					697- 2-10			266-13- 4
ARREARS	£ 928-13- 4	£ 3,427- 2- 1	£ 9,214-12- 5	£20,439-17- 7	£ 9,311-15- 6	-	-£9,468-14- 9	-
TOTAL CHARGE	£19,780- 7- 7	£66,918- 3- 1	£45,635- 2-10	£23,048-13- 1	£20,083- 3- 0	£31,338-11- 8	£11,291- 3- 7	£10,275-10- 9
DISCHARGE	£17,200- 0- 0 Approx	£61,130-12- 9	£34,409-17- 7	£34,176-15- 2	£31,841-12- 4	£38,771- 0- 3	£1,492 -15-11	£12,241- 8- 4
BALANCE	£ 3,400- 0- 0 Approx	£ 9,214-12- 5	£20,439-17- 7	£ 9,311-15- 6	£ 2,446-13- 9	-£ 7,432- 8- 7	£ 329-12- 0	-£ 1,965-17- 7

*Including Raw Material

APPENDIX B/9(c) 1511-12 ACCOUNT LIST OF ROYAL PENSIONERS (TA iv, 267-272)

NAME	OCCUPATION	RECEIPT	DURATION
Kently, Lord Sinclair	Master of Artillery	£100- 0- 0	Year
Alex. Dunbar, dean of Dunbar		66-13- 4	Year
Sir Alex. McCulloch, of Mireton	Master Falconer	100- 0- 0	Year
James Stewart of Traquair		40- 0- 0	Year
Master James Henreson	Advocate	40- 0- 0	Year
Master James Stewart, (son of Earl of Athole)		40- 0- 0	Year
Master Patirck Coventre	Danish Doctor	40- 0- 0	Year
Master James Murray		40- 0- 0	Year
Sir James Inglis	Clerk of King's closet	40- 0- 0	Year
James Stewart (son of Laird of Ardgowan)		40- 0- 0	Year
William Stirling		40- 0- 0	Year
James Winchester	Furrier	40- 0- 0	Year
Master Maxwell		100 French crowns	Year
Master John Chisholm		26-13- 4	Year
Master James Simpson		20- 0- 0	Year
Master William Dunbar		80- 0- 0	Year
Sir Alex. Makeson		13- 6- 8	Year
Sir John Sharp	Keeper of King's garden ato Holyrood	6-13- 4	Year
Nicholas Abernethy		6- 0- 0	Quarter
Simon Cunningham		10- 0- 0	Quarter
Sir William Fraser		10- 0- 0	Quarter
Thomas Clerk		50- 0- 0	Year
Chaplains of Dunblane 'that singis for the Kingis Grace'		6-13- 4	Quarter
Chaplains of Cambuskenneth 'tht singis for the Kingis Grace'		13- 6- 8	Year
Adam Cockburn	(For his clothing £20) pension	40- 0- 0	Year
William Cockburn		10- 0- 0	Quarter
+ 12 others (See P 269)	Chaplains	each 10- 0- 0	Quarter
Matthew Campbell		1 Light French crown	Week
James Dog		1 " " "	Week
Dande Doule		1 " " "	Week
Squire of Cleisch		15 " " "	Year
Thomas Edgar	Tailor	10- 0- 0	Year
John Davidson	Condiner	10- 0- 0	Year
Persone	Gunner	10- 0-0	Year
Nicholas	Gunner	10- 0- 0	Year
John Hartside	Tentmaker	5- 0- 0	Year

NAME	OCCUPATION	RECEIPT	DURATION
Mistress Frances	Queen's Servant	(£5 sterling) £35- 0- 0	Year
	Lathener of Queen's Wardrobe	2- 0- 0	Year
	Spanish Knight	54- 2- 0	Year
William Hamilton		40- 0- 0	Year
John Aitken	Goldsmith	6 French crowns	Month
French and Italian Minstrals	Summer and Yule livery	6-10- 0 (each)	
French and Italian Minstrals		Fees 6 French crowns and 3/6	Month
John Sparty	Smith	10- 0- 0	Year
Cressent	Italian mason	7- 0- 0	Month
Martin Buschard	Carver	5-12- 0	Month
Martin Buschard's servant		3 French crowns	Month
Wolf	Gunner	4- 4- 0	Month
William White	Potter	40- 0- 0	Year
Robert	Cutler	1- 0- 0 and dagger	

TOTAL £2,750- 5- 2

APPENDIX B/10(a) DETAILS OF THE ACCOUNTS OF MASTER OF THE MINT. (ER, iv-ix)

	May June 1433-4	June July 1434-5	Sept July 1436-8	July June 1438-40	June Sept 1440-1	Sept July 1441-2	2 Accounts July July 1442-3	Dec July 1442-3
Gold Minting Profit	£ 28- 1- 0	£ 24-17- 6	£30- 6- 6	£ 8-11- 0	£ 1- 4- 0	£ 1-10- 0	£ 4- 6- 0	£ 0- 1- 0
Amount Minted	306 ozs.	31 lb. 2 oz.2gr	37 lb. 14½oz	10 lb. 11 oz.	1 lb. 8 oz.	1 lb. 14 oz.	5 lbs. 6 oz.	1 oz.
Silver into Groats	45-15- 9	57- 7- 9	63- 3- 8	42-13- 4	7-12- 4	7- 17-4	7- 6- 8	5- 1- 4
Amount Minted	114 lbs.7½oz	123 lbs.7oz 2 gr	236 lbs.15oz	160 lbs.	26 lbs.11oz.	29 lbs. 8 oz.	27 lbs. 8 oz.	18 lbs.15 oz.
Silver into Pennies		12-10- 4	20- 0- 0	8-15- 0	4- 2- 6	2-10- 0	3-10- 0	4-13- 0
Amount Minted		50 lb. 1 oz	80 lbs.	35 lbs.	16 lbs. 8 oz.	10 lbs.	14 lbs.	18 lbs.12 oz.
Black Money								
TOTAL	£73-16- 9	£94-15- 7	£113-10- 2	£59-19- 4	£12- 8-10	£11-17- 4	£15- 2- 8	£9 -16- 4
viz Treasurer, Steward or Comptroller								
KING						* £ 8-15-10	£11-18-11	£ 9- 1- 4
* Sir William Crichton	-	-	£ 47-10- 4	£50-10- 3	£ 8- 4- 3			

	July June 1443-4	Sept July 1444-7	July Sept 1447-8	Sept July 1448-1450	May June 1452-3	Nov July 1456-7	Aug July 1458-9	July June 1459-64
Gold Minting Profit	£ 1- 1- 0	5-12- 0	3- 9- 6	1-10- 0			0- 8- 0	9-14- 6
Amount Minted	1 lb. 5oz	7 lb.	4 lbs.5½oz	1 lb.14 oz.		10¾oz.	4 oz.	12 lb. 2½oz.
Silver into Groats	3- 6- 8	24-12- 0	20-18- 2	13- 8- 8	45- 3- 4	?	36- 0- 0	51- 9- 0
Amount Minted	12 lb. 8 oz.	92 lbs. 4oz.	78 lbs.6½oz	54 lb. 2 oz.	338 lbs.12 oz.	177 lbs. 4½oz	273 lbs.11oz	385 lbs.14oz.
Silver and Pennies	4- 0- 0						13-13- 0	6- 6- 0
Amount Minted	16 lbs.						204 lbs.12oz	94 lbs. 8½oz
Black Money								
TOTAL	£ 8- 7- 8	£30- 4- 0	£24- 7- 8	£15-18- 8	£45- 3- 4	-	£50- 1- 0	£67- 9- 6
Viz Treasurer, Steward or Comptroller								
KING	-	-	-	-	£45- 3- 4	-	-	£10-18- 0
Sir William Crichton								

	June July 1464-5	July June 1465-6	June June 1466-8	Mar July 1474-6	Oct Aug 1486-7
Gold Minting Profit	£ 2-14- 9	£ 0-17- 0	£ 2-18-10	£10-13- 0	£ 6- 9- 0
Amount Minted	4 lbs.6¾oz.	1 lb. 1 oz.	3 lbs.10¾oz.	13 lbs.	8 lbs. 1oz.
Silver into Groats	9- 6- 2	1- 9- 0	12-17- 1	36- 8- 0	24- 2- 8
Amount Minted	69 lbs.13oz	10 lbs.14¾oz	93 lbs.	273 lbs.	181 lbs.
Silver into Pennies	4- 9- 0	8- 2- 5	3-11-11	9- 0- 0	
Amount Minted	66 lbs.12½oz	121 lbs.13 oz.	53 lbs.15 oz.	140 lbs. 8 oz.	
Black Money			£650- 0- 0		
TOTAL	£16- 9-11	£10- 8- 5	£668-18- 9	£56- 8- 4	£30-11- 8
Viz Treasurer,Steward or Comptroller KING	£15- 0- 0	£10- 8- 5	£565-19- 8	£56- 8- 4	N.R
Sir William Crichton					

APPENDIX B/10(b) TRIDEX OF CURRENT PRICES, i.e. PRICES ACTUALL PAID OR RECEIVED BY CONSUMERS AND PRODUCERS.

1. Price of a Composite Unit of Foodstuffs
2. Sample of Industrial Products.

(1451-75 = 100)

E.H. Phelps Brown and S.V. Hopkins 'Wage Rates and Prices: Evidence of Population Pressure in

1. Certain grains, malt, butter, meat, fish
2. Charcoal, candles, oil, canvas, cloth, building materials etc.

	1.	2.
1401-10	115	107
1411-20	111	107
1421-30	107	108
1431-40	118	106
1441-50	95	101
1451-60	98	99
1461-70	105	103
1471-80	93	100
1481-90	121	103
1441-1500	100	97
1501-10	106	98
1511-20	116	102
1521-30	159	110
1531-40	161	110
1541-50	217	127
1551-60	315	186
1561-90	298	218
1571-80	341	223
1591-1600	530	238
1641-50	723	306

APPENDIX B/10(c) PRICE INDEX WITHIN THE EARLDOM OF MORAY FROM 1455-1513

(ER, Vols vii-xiii)

		WHEAT			BARLEY OR BERE	
		@ Boll	@ Chalder		@ Boll	@ Chalder
1462	Sale	9/-	£7- 4- 0	1458	6/-	£4-16- 0
1465		6/9	5- 6- 8	1460	3/4	2-13- 4
1466		6/8	5- 6- 8	1462	8/-	6- 8- 0
1469		6/8	5- 6- 8	1465	6/8	5- 6- 8
1471		6/8	5- 6- 8	1469	3/10	3- 1-10
1473		5/-	4- 0- 0	1471	3/4	2-13- 4
1474		5/-	4- 0- 0	1473	3/4	2-13- 4
1475		5/-	4- 0- 0	1474	3/6	2- 6- 0
1476		6/10	5-10- 0	1475	4/3	3- 6- 8
1477		6/8	5- 6- 8	1476	5/5	4- 7- 3
1479		6/10	5-10- 0	1477	6/8	5- 6- 8
1480		7/-	5-12- 0	1478	8/-	6- 8- 0
		5/3	4- 3- 4	1480	4/3	3- 6- 8
1481		8/-	6- 8- 0	1481	7/-	5-12- 0
1485		7/6	6- 0- 0	1491	6/8	5- 6- 8
1489		7/6	6- 0- 0	1504	4/4	3- 7- 6
1491		6/8	5- 6- 8	1509	5/6	4- 8- 0
1504		9/4	7-10- 0	1510	4/-	3- 4- 0
1506		10/-	8- 0- 0	1512	5/-	4- 0- 0
1509		7/10	6- 6- 8			
1512		6/8	5- 6- 8			
1513		6/8	5- 6- 8			

APPENDIX B/10(c) PRICE INDEX WITHIN THE EARLDOM OF MORAY FROM 1455-1513

(ER, Vols vii-xiii)

	WHEAT			BARLEY OR BERE		
		@ Boll	@ Chalder		@ Boll	@ Chalder
1462	Sale	9/-	£7- 4- 0	1458	6/-	£4-16- 0
1465		6/9	5- 6- 8	1460	3/4	2-13- 4
1466		6/8	5- 6- 8	1462	8/-	6- 8- 0
1469		6/8	5- 6- 8	1465	6/8	5- 6- 8
1471		6/8	5- 6- 8	1469	3/10	3- 1-10
1473		5/-	4- 0- 0	1471	3/4	2-13- 4
1474		5/-	4- 0- 0	1473	3/4	2-13- 4
1475		5/-	4- 0- 0	1474	3/6	2- 6- 0
1476		6/10	5-10- 0	1475	4/3	3- 6- 8
1477		6/8	5- 6- 8	1476	5/5	4- 7- 3
1479		6/10	5-10- 0	1477	6/8	5- 6- 8
1480		7/-	5-12- 0	1478	8/-	6- 8- 0
		5/3	4- 3- 4	1480	4/3	3- 6- 8
1481		8/-	6- 8- 0	1481	7/-	5-12- 0
1485		7/6	6- 0- 0	1491	6/8	5- 6- 8
1489		7/6	6- 0- 0	1504	4/4	3- 7- 6
1491		6/8	5- 6- 8	1509	5/6	4- 8- 0
1504		9/4	7-10- 0	1510	4/-	3- 4- 0
1506		10/-	8- 0- 0	1512	5/-	4- 0- 0
1509		7/10	6- 6- 8			
1512		6/8	5- 6- 8			
1513		6/8	5- 6- 8			

APPENDIX B/10(d) SALE PRICE OF ENGLISH GRAIN IN SCOTLAND FROM DIVERSE CUSTOMS ACCOUNTS. (ER, Vols. vii, xiii)

Price Per Boll	BEER	WHEAT	BARLEY
1467	9/6		
1468	8/-		
1471	9/8		
1474	8/-		
1475	8/4		
1476	8/- or 9/-		
1477	9/- or 10/-		
1478	9/- or 13/4	9/- or 10/-	
1479	12/-		
1480	10/- or 12/-		9/-
1481	11/- or 12/-		
1488	15/9		15/-
1489	16/-		10/3 or 17/6
1490	10/- 11/- or 11/9 (7/- Partly soiled by water)	14/-	
1491			8/- or 10/-
1493		14/-	
1494		9/5	6/-, 8/- or 10/-
1495			6/-
1496	6/8		7/-
1508			15/-
1509		10/-	11/-
1510		8/2	
1511		8/-	9/-
1512			12/-

APPENDIX B/10(e) MISCELLANEOUS PRICES FROM SALE OF PRODUCE FROM ROYAL PROPERTY

BARLEY OR BEER FROM FIFE @ Boll		OATS FROM FIFE @ Boll		MEAL FROM GALLOWAY @ Boll	
1461	9/-, 10/-	1453	2/-, 2/6	1456	5/-
1471	5/-	1455	5/-, 6/-	1457	8/-
1477	3/9, 7/6	1456	4/2	1458	4/6
1479	10/6	1460	5/-	1460	5/6, 6/-
1481	10/-	1464	3/-	1461	4/6, 6/8, 8/-, 10/-
1491	6/8	1467	3/9	1462	10/-
1494	6/-	1469	4/-	1463	4/-, 8/-
1497	10/-, 11/-	1476	4/-	1465	6/8
1498	10/2, 10/-	1477	4/2	1466	6/8
1499	10/-	1481	4/-	1468	6/8
1504	10/-	1490	5/-	1469	6/8, 8/4
1505	9/5	1495	3/-	1471	6/8
1506	9/-	1496	1/10	1474	5/-
1510	5/6	1497	4/6	1475	6/8
		1504	4/-	1476	7/6
		1506	4/2	1477	8/6
				1478	10/-, 12/-
				1479	8/-
				1480	4/2, 5/-
				1481	5/-, 6/8
				1482	16/-, £1
				1484	8/4
				1485	7/10
				1486	6/8
				1487	6/8, 8/4
				1488	9/2
				1489	12/-
				1490	8/3
				1491	6/8
				1492	6/8
				1496	6/8
				1498	6/1
				1499	6/-
				1502	7/6
				1506	5/-

BIBLOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES : SCOTTISH RECORD OFFICE

1. EXCHEQUER

Exchequer Rolls (including the Accounts of the Ballivi ad Extra, Customs, Burgh baillies, sheriffs, chamberlain, comptroller and master of the mint).

Treasurers' Rolls

Rentalia Domini Regis

Libri Domicilii

Libri Emptorum

Customs Books

Treasury Precepts and Receipts

Household Papers and Accounts

2. COUNCIL

Acta Dominorum Concilii.

3. PRIVATE MUNIMENTS

Register House Charters

Inventory of Boyd Papers

Calendar of Swinton Charters

Broughton and Cally Muniments

Inventory of Ailsa Muniments

Inventory of Leven and Melville Muniments

Calendar of Yestir Writs

Inventory of Morton Papers

Inventory of Papers and Titles of Viscount Eubank

Glencairn Muniments

Gordon Castle Muniments

Barcley-Allardice Papers

Lord Forbes Collection

Murray of Ochtertyre Papers

Makgill Charters

Inventory of Fraser Charters

Inventory of Mey Charters

Breadalbane Muniments

Errol Charters

Mar and Kellie Muniments

PRIMARY SOURCES (PRINTED) a) PUBLIC RECORDS

Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, 4 vols, (1877-1902)

"Accounts of Sir Duncan Forrester of Skipinch, Comproller, 1495-1499"
Ed. P. Gouldsbrough, Miscellany of Scottish History, Vol. IX, (1958)

ACTA DOMINORUM AUDITORUM (Acts of The Lords Auditors of Causes And Complaints), 1466-1494. (1839)

ACTA DOMINORUM CONCILII (Acts of The Lords of The Council in Civil Causes) 1468-1495. (1839)

ACTA DOMINORUM COUNCILII, 1501-1503, Ed. J.A. Clyde (Stair Society, 1942)

ACTS OF THE LORDS OF THE COUNCIL IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS, 1501-1554,
Ed. R.K. Hanney (1932).

ACTS OF THE PARLIAMENTS OF SCOTLAND, Vols. i, ii and xii, (1814, 1844, 1875).

CRIMINAL TRIALS IN SCOTLAND, Ed. R. Pitcairn, Vol. 1, (1833)

EXCERPTA E LIBRIS DOMICILII DOMINI JACOBI QUINTI REGIS SCOTORUM, 1525-1533
(Bannatyne Club, 1836)

EXCHEQUER ROLLS OF SCOTLAND, 13 Vols. (1877-1891)

REGISTRUM MAGNI SIGILLI REGUM SCOTORUM, Ed. J.M. Thompson (1912)

REGISTRUM MAGNI SIGILLI REGUM SCOTORUM, 1424-1513, Ed. J.B. Paul (1882)

REGISTRUM SECRETI SIGILLI REGUM SCOTORUM, 1488-1529, Ed. M. Livingstone (1908)

CALENDAR OF DOCUMENTS REGLATING TO SCOTLAND, 1357-1509, Vol. iv, (1888)

b) BURGH RECORDS

EXTRACTS FROM THE COUNCIL REGISTER OF THE BURGH OF ABERDEEN, 1398-1570
(Spalding Club, 1844)

'EXTRACTS FROM THE REGISTERS OF THE BURGH OF ABERDEEN', 'EXTRACTS FROM THE ACCOUNTS OF THE BURGH OF ABERDEEN', MISCELLANY OF SPALDING CLUB, Vol. V, (1852)

CHARTERS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE CITY OF EDINBURGH, 1124-1548
(Scottish Burgh Records Society 1871)

CHARTERS AND OTHER RECORDS RELATING TO THE BURGH OF PEEBLES, 1165-1710,
(Scottish Burgh Records Society, 1872)

RECORDS OF THE CONVENTION OF THE ROYAL BURGHS OF SCOTLAND, 1295-1597, (1866)

EARLY RECORDS OF ABERDEEN, 1317, 1398-1407. (Scottish History Society 1957)

C) CARTULARIES, FAMILY MUNIMENTS AND OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES.

BAKER, J.H., COPIALE PRIORATOS SANCTIANDREE (1930)

DICKINSON, DONALDSON, MILNE, SOURCE BOOK OF SCOTTISH HISTORY, 3 Vols. (1952-4)

DOUGLAS, GAVIN, POETICAL WORKS, Ed. J. Small, 4 Vols. (1874)

DUNBAR, WILLIAM, POEMS, Ed. J. Small (Scottish Text Society, 1885)

DUNLOP, ANNIE I, 'BAGIMONDS ROLL', MISCELLANY OF SCOTTISH HISTORY SOCIETY, Vol. VI, (1939)

FACSIMILES OF NATIONAL MANUSCRIPTS OF SCOTLAND, Vol. iii, (1871)

FRASER, SIR WILLIAM, ANNANDALE BOOK, (1894)
CARTULARY OF CAMBUSKENNETH. (Grampian Club 1872)
CARTULARY OF COLQUHOUN. (1873)
CARTULARY OF POLLOCK MAXWELL (1875)
CHIEFS OF GRANT, (1883)
DOUGLAS BOOK (1885)
THE LENNOX (1874)
MEMORIALS OF THE MONTGOMERIES - EARLS OF EGLINTON (1859)
RED BOOK OF MENTEITH (1880)
SCOTTS OF BUCCLEUCH (1878)
STIRLINGS OF KEIR AND THEIR FAMILY PAPERS (1858)

GOODHALL, WALTER, JOANNIS DE FORDUN SCOTICHRONICON, Vol. ii, (1759)

INNES, COSMO, A GENEALOGICAL DEDUCTION OF THE FAMILY OF ROSE OF KILRAVOCK, (Spalding Club, 1848)
BOOK OF THE THANES OF CAWDOR, 1236-1742, (Spalding Club, 1859)

LAWRIE, Sir ARCHIBALD C, EARLY SCOTTISH CHARTERS, (1905)

LIBER ECCLESIE de SCON, (Bannatyne Club 1843)

LINDSAY, Sir DAVID, ANE SATYRE OF THE THRIE ESTATTS, Ed. J. Kinsley (1954)

REGISTRUM de DUNFERMELYN (Bannatyne Club 1842)

REID, R.C., WIGTOWNSHIRE CHARTERS (Scottish History Society, 1960)

"RETOUR AND ROYAL WARRANT OF TAXATION OF THE LANDS IN THE SHERIFFDOM OF EDINBURGH IN THE YEAR 1479', BANNATYNE MISCELLANY, Vol. iii, (1855)

RYMER, T., FOEDERA, Vols. xi, xiii, (1710-2)

SWINTON, A.C., THE SWINTONS OF THAT ILK, (1933)

ROYAL COMMISSION ON HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE TOPOGRAPHY AND ANTIQUITIES OF THE SHIRES OF ABERDEEN AND BANFF, 4 Vols. (Spalding Club 1847-69)

LEDGER OF ANDREW HALIBURTON, 1492-1503, (1867)

RENTALE DUNKELDENSE, 1505-1517, (Scottish History Scoiety, 1915)

LETTERS OF JAMES IV, 1505-1513, (Scottish History Society, 1953)

REGISTRUM EPISCOPATOS MORAVIENSIS (Bannatyne Club 1837)

SECONDARY SOURCES a) BOOKS

ANCIENT MONUMENTS (SCOTLAND), ROYAL COMMISSION ON,
INVENTORY OF THE ANCIENT AND HISTORICAL MONUMENTS OF SELKIRKSHIRE, (1957)

THE PRACTICKS OF SIR JAMES BALFOUR OF PITTENDREICH, 2 Vols, Ed. P.G.B. McNeill, (Stair Society 1962-3)

BAILFOUR-MELVILLE, E.W.M., JAMES I, KING OF SCOTS, (1936)

BROWN, P. HOME, HISTORY OF SCOTLAND, Vol I, (1900)

BUCHANAN, GEORGE,

COCHRANE-PATRICK, R.W., EARLY RECORDS RELATING TO MINING IN SCOTLAND (1878)
MEDIEAVAL SCOTLAND (1892)
RECORDS OF THE COINAGE OF SCOTLAND (1876)

CRUDEN, STEWART, THE SCOTTISH CASTLE, (1963)

CRAWFORD, LORD, THE EARLDOM OF MAR

CRAIG, SIR THOMAS, JUS FEUDALE, Ed. J.A. Clyde, 2 Vols. (1934)

DICKINSON, W. CROFT, EARLY RECORDS OF THE BURGH OF ABERDEEN (Scottish Histroy Society, 1957) : INTRODUCTION
SCOTLAND FROM EARLIEST TIMES TO 1603
THE SHERIFF COURT BOOK OF FIFE, (Scottish History Society, 1928) : INTRODUCTION.

DONALDSON, GORDON, SCOTTISH KINGS (1967)

DUNLOP, ANNIE J., THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JAMES KENNEDY, BISHOP OF ST.ANDREWS, (1950)

BATESON, MARY, 'The Scottish King's Household', MISCELLANY OF THE SCOTTISH HISTORY SOCIETY, Va II (1904)

MALCOLM, C.A., 'The Office of Sheriff in Scotland' S.H.R. xx, 1923.

ROSENTHAL, J.T., 'THE ESTATES AND FINANCES OF RICHARD, Duke of York, 1411-60' STUDIES IN MEDIAEVAL AND RENAISSANCE HISTORY, Vol. II

GROOME, FRANCIS H., ORDNANCE GAZETTEER OF SCOTLAND, (2nd Edition)

HATCHER, J., THE RURAL ECONOMY AND SOCIETY IN THE DUCHY OF CORNWALL 1300-1500.

GRANT, I.F., THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF SCOTLAND BEFORE 1603

JOHNSON C., DIALOGUS DE SCACCARIO (1950)

LESLIE, JOHN, HISTORY OF SCOTLAND, Ed. Thomas Thompson. (Bannatyne Club 1830)

LANDER, J.R., CONFLICT AND STABILITY IN FIFTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND (1969)

LINDSAY, SIR ROBERT, OF PITSCOTTIE, THE HISTORY OF SCOTLAND, (1728)

LYTHE, S.G.E., THE ECONOMY OF SCOTLAND, 1550-1625 (1960)

McGIBBON AND ROSS, CASTELLATED AND DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE OF SCOTLAND, (1892)

MACKIE, R.L., KING JAMES IV of SCOTLAND (1958)

MACKIE, J.D., HISTORY OF SCOTLAND (1964)

MYRES, A.R., THE HOUSEHOLD OF EDWARD IV, (1959)

MITCHISON, R., HISTORY OF SCOTLAND, (196)

NAPIER, MARK, MEMOIRS OF JOHN NAPIER OF MERCHISTON, (1834)

OUTHWAITE, R.B., INFLATION IN TUDOR AND EARLY STUART ENGLAND (1969)

PAGAN, THEODORA, THE CONVENTION OF THE ROYAL BURGHS OF SCOTLAND (1926)

PAUL, SIR JAMES BAIFOUR, THE SCOTS PEERAGE, 9 Vols (1904-14)

POOLE, R.L., THE EXCHEQUER IN THE TWELTH CENTURY (1912)

PRYDE, GEORGE S., AYR BURGH ACCOUNTS (Scottish History Society 1937) : INTRODUCTION.

PURVES, SIR WILLIAM, REVENUE OF THE SCOTTISH CROWN, 1681, Ed. D. Murray Rose, (1897)

RAIT, Robert S., THE PARLIAMENTS OF SCOTLAND (1924)

REID, W. STAMFORD, SKIPPER FROM LEITH, HISTORY OF ROBERT BARTON OF OVER BARNTON

SKENE, SIR JOHN, DE VERBORUM SIGNIFICATIONE, (1597)

WOLFFE, B.P., THE CROWN LANDS, 1461-1536. (1970)
THE ROYAL DEMESNE IN ENGLISH HISTORY. (1971)

STEWART, I.H., THE SCOTTISH COINAGE, (1967)

THOMPSON, J.D.A., INVENTORY OF BRITISH COIN HOARDS, 600-1500, (1956)

HANDBOOK OF BRITISH CHRONOLOGY, Ed. Powicke and Pryde (2nd Edition 1961)

DAVIDSON and GRAY, THE SCOTTISH STAPLE AT VEERE (1909)

SYMON, J.A., SCOTTISH FARMING, PAST AND PRESENT, (1959)

CUNNINGHAM, LOYAL CLANS

POWER and POSTAN, ENGLISH TRADE IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

MISKIMIN, THE ECONOMY OF EARLY RENAISSANCE EUROPE

b) ARTICLES

PACH, Z.P. 'The Development of Feudal Rent in Hungary in The Fifteenth Century'. E.C.H.R 2nd Series, XLX (1966).

BLANCHARD, I. 'Population Change, Enclosure and The Early Tudor Economy' E C H R, 2nd Series. (1970)

CIPOLLA, C.M. 'Currency Depreciation in Mediaeval Europe' E C H R, 2nd Series, XV (1962)

BEAN, J.M.W. 'Plague, Population and Economic Decline in England in the Later Middle Ages' ECHR, 2nd Series, XV (1962)

VAN HOUTTE, J.A. 'The Bruges Market', E.C.H.R, 2nd Series, XLX. (1966)

PARTNER, P.D. 'Camera Papae; The Problems of Papel Finance in the Later Middle Ages', JOURNAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, III-IV, (1952-3)

PARTNER, P.D. 'The Budget of the Roman Church in the Renaissance Period' ITALIAN RENAISSNACE STUDIES, ED. E.F. Jacobs (1960)

DAVIES, R.R. 'Baronial Accounts, Incomes and Arrears in the Later Middle Ages'. E.C.H.R, 2nd Series, XXI (1968)

WOLFF, B.P. 'Acts of Resumption in Lancastrian Parliaments, 1399-1453' E H R, LXXIII, (1958)

McFARLANE, K.B. 'Loans to Lancastrian Kings', Cambridge Historical Journal, IX, (1947-9)

ROSS, C.D. 'Forfeiture for Treason in the Reign of Richard II' E H R, LXXI, (1956)

POSTAN, M. 'The Fifteenth Century' E C H R, IX, (1939)

WOLFF, B.P. 'The Management of English Royal Estates under the Yorkist Kings', E H R, LXXI (1956)

NICHOLSON, R 'David II, The Historians and the Chroniclers' SHR

CRAWFORD, B.E. 'The Pawning of Orkney and Shetland, A Reconsideration of the Events of 1460-9'. SHR, XLVIII (1969)

THOMPSON, T. 'Memorial on Old Extent', ED J.C. Mackie, STAIR SOCIETY, X (1946)

MURRAY, A.L. 'Sir John Skene and the Exchequer', STAIR SOCIETY, MISCELLANY 1, XXVI, (1971)
Introduction to Accounts of the Treasurer of Scotland, Vol. xii, (1970)

BATESON, Mary, 'The Scottish King's Household', Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, Vol II (1904)

MALCOLM, C.A. 'The Office of Sheriff in Scotland' S.H.R. xx, 1923.

ROSENTHAL, J.T. 'The Estates and Finances of Richard, Duke of York, 1411-60' Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance History, Vol. II